

On the Jewish Question

Karl Marx, anti-Semitism, and the War against the West

Introduction

The origins of Marxist anti-Semitism

On the Jewish Question Part I - prelude to Jew-Hatred

On the Jewish Question Part II - Jew Hatred

On the Jewish Question and the Bolsheviks

On the Jewish Question and Hitler

On the Jewish Question apologists

Conclusion

Introduction

While French Revolutionary Gracchus Babeuf was the first radical to call himself a communist in 1796, Karl Marx, the author of *The Communist Manifesto*, published in 1848, was and remains undoubtedly the most influential promoter of communism in history. Marx is also the author of an anti-Semitic tract, published in 1844 entitled *On the Jewish Question*. Marx wrote *On the Jewish Question* in response to a short book entitled *The Jewish Question* which was written by his revolutionary contemporary Bruno Bauer. Due to Marx enduring influence on politics and culture, his book *On the Jewish Question* belongs in the same infamous pantheon of anti-Semitic hate literature as *Mein Kampf* by Adolf Hitler and *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*.

Marx tract influenced Hitler who incorporated its concepts into his philosophy as this book will demonstrate. The type of political pseudo-scientific anti-Semitism that Marx promoted in *On the Jewish Question* continues to hold sway over the left to this day although the influence often assumes more subtle manifestations. Indeed, the anti-Semitic theories that Marx espoused have morphed beyond a strict application to the Jews and has come to encompass a view held by the left toward the United States, toward religious Christians, toward the western democracies and toward free-market capitalism in general. The book that you are now reading re-publishes *On the Jewish Question* in its entirety and places the text in its full context with analysis.

The enduring influence of *On the Jewish Question*, as well as the influence of Marx himself has caused this anti-Semitic screed to slip through the proverbial Orwellian memory hole. While the book was once widely read and absorbed in leftist circles it is virtually unknown today. *On the Jewish Question* influenced the so-called progressives in the decades following its publication and was a standard of left-wing literature until World War II. (1.) Unlike *Mein Kampf*, with its openly anti-Semitic crackpot race theories and unlike *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, which is a proven forgery, the ideas contained within *On the Jewish Question* continue to resonate particularly in left liberal circles and in Islamic nations. Marx anti-Semitism finds its expression in

a homogenized worldview that has subtly contributed to the ongoing war against the State of Israel as well as the war against American and western values. In the broad sense the philosophy and worldview of Marxism has come to colonize the minds and souls of vast numbers of people particularly those who are on the highest echelons of society.

Marx attitude toward the Jews is discernible in the tendency of his modern followers to accept the various characteristics that Marx ascribed to the Jews in *On the Jewish Question* as negative and then to graft those characteristics onto the free world. Marx described Jews as possessing an *anti-social* element. We will delve into what Marx meant by this. What Marx described as anti-social was elements of the human character that are positive to the human being, aspects that foster free societies and genuine progress in the real meaning of the term.

More fundamentally, the elements that Marx attributes to the Jews are basic and natural to the human being. In order to accomplish his goal of world transformation toward Communism, Marx advised, and rightfully from his point of view, that the human elements he ascribed to the Jews would have to be expunged from all people. He advocated that in order to affect his view of progress, Judaism must be expunged. While Marx did not invent scientific anti-Semitism, and while Marx was not necessarily a Christian or racist anti-Semite, his book gave political anti-Semitism a voice and the imprimatur of legitimacy. The most classic statement found in *On the Jewish Question*, the one that captures Marx attitude with regard to what he contended were the characteristics of the Jews was as follows:

What is the secular basis of Judaism? Practical need, self-interest. What is the worldly religion of the Jew? Huckstering. What is his worldly God? Money.

On the Jewish Question has been criticized from both the left and the right. Noted British historian and Middle East scholar Bernard Lewis described *On the Jewish Question* as one of the classics of anti-Semitic propaganda. (2.) American Historian Gertrude Himmelfarb referred to Marx views in *On the Jewish Question* as part of the classic repertoire of anti-Semitism. Dennis K. Fischman, the author of *Political Discourse in Exile: Karl Marx and the Jewish Question*, commenting on Marx book observed: *Jews, Marx seems to be saying, can only become free when, as Jews, they no longer exist.* Researcher Robert Wistrich, in a 1974 scholarly article published in *Soviet Jewish Affairs* wrote...*the net result of Marx's essay is to reinforce a traditional anti-Jewish stereotype - the identification of the Jews with money making - in the sharpest possible manner.* British author and journalist Paul Johnson wrote: *The second part of Marx's essay is almost a classic anti-Semitic tract, based upon a fantasized Jewish archetype and a conspiracy to corrupt the world.*

In the text of *On the Jewish Question*, Marx accused the Jews of

possessing so-called anti-social elements when he wrote: *we recognize in Judaism, therefore, a general anti-social element of the present time, an element that through historical development - to which in this harmful respect the Jews have zealously contributed - has been brought to its present high level, at which it must necessarily begin to disintegrate.* (4.)

Marx viewed these characteristics as obstacles that were standing in the way of his vaguely defined view of human progress. He contended that those so-called anti-social elements, aspects of human nature that he claimed were the exclusive purview of the Jews, were artificial forms of false consciousness as represented by a false construct which, he contended, was Judaism itself. He argued that Judaism was the primary source of this false consciousness and was therefore corrupting the rest of humanity. This was a social version of the Nazi theory which was that the Jews posed as a biological corrupting element in Germany and the world. Thus, Marx contended, this false consciousness, as Marx described it, would disintegrate if Judaism were to disappear. In these times of danger for the Jews of Israel and, by extension, these times of danger for any person or group that might be defined as possessing these so-called anti-social elements, an understanding of the ideas that Marx pushed into the world becomes urgent.

Karl Marx clearly did not invent anti-Semitism. A case could be made that the phenomena goes back as far as the events described in the biblical Book of Esther, events which are believed to have occurred around 400 B.C. The narrative of the Book of Esther, read during the Jewish holiday of Purim, indicates that Haman, the chief advisor to Achashverosh, the Emperor of the Persians and the Medes, sought to annihilate the Jewish people because of the action of one Jew, Mordecai, who refused to bow down low in his presence. Achashverosh had ordered his entire nation to bow in the presence of Haman but Mordechai the Jew refused explaining that his religion dictated that he bow to no man but only to God. Mordecai's refusal to submit to Haman, who represented the earthly power of the state, enraged Haman who responded with a plot to annihilate the Jews or to *disintegrate* them to use the nomenclature coined by Marx. Mordechai, by being a rugged individualist who had the courage to stand up to secular state power, demonstrated the same anti-social elements that enraged Marx regarding Jews over two thousand years later.

Jesus of Nazareth possessed these same so-called anti-social elements that Marx ascribed to the Jews including the fact that Jesus stood up to the mighty Roman Empire. Jesus refused to cooperate with the Roman governor Pontius Pilate who questioned him before ordering his crucifixion. This anti-social act of defiance, when Jesus was reported to have said to Pilate that he answered only to a higher authority, has inspired acts of defiance against the power of the state ever since. Christianity, the religion that emanated from Jesus ministry, calls for a

personal relationship with the almighty, a relationship that supersedes the power of the state. This genuinely progressive idea threatened Roman authority. That same idea, the assertion of the natural and sovereign rights of the individual, threatened the collectivist goals of Marx. This principle continues to threaten the agenda of Marx modern authoritarian followers.

The power of the ancient state was based upon the concept of the divine right of Kings and their assumed grant of absolute power. It was this type of authority that Marx sought to establish in the face of emerging democratic principles of individual rights and private ownership in 19th century Europe. Europeans in his time were rapidly embracing the idea that rights come from the creator and not from the state and that moral and ethical principles were absolute and of divine origin as opposed to relative where they could be susceptible to human manipulation. Marx repackaged the ancient principle of collectivist totalitarianism and sold it to his followers by giving it a modern and scientific sounding cadence.

Marx and his cohorts turned reality on its head by claiming that it was they who stood for freedom. In order to accomplish their unnatural fantasy of total and universal control, in the name of progress, and in order to convince enough people to go along with their idea of replacing what was then an emerging trend toward limited government as inspired by the example of the United States of America, Marx had to identify and scapegoat an enemy. He found that enemy in the pages of *On the Jewish Question*.

Christianity most certainly did contain within it a heritage of anti-Semitism and this carried over into the Catholic Church as well as into the Protestant Reformation as Martin Luther was clearly an anti-Semite. These anti-Jewish attitudes were originally attributable to the fierce competition that had developed between Judaism and Christianity in the early and formative centuries of the Christian era. Early Christian and Jewish theologians bitterly attacked each other in accusatory writings that were influential in their day. Christianity eventually got the upper hand when the anti-Semitic Roman Emperor Constantine declared Christianity as the state religion of Rome. The Jews thus became a persecuted minority. Exacerbating this was the erosion of the Jewish population in their homeland of Judaea to the degree that national sovereignty becomes virtually impossible. The Jews thus became a stateless people, guests in the lands of others and vulnerable to the vicissitudes of prevailing and unpredictable political and social winds.

By the 19th century, the Jews of Europe were experiencing major and systemic improvements in the nature of their condition and these improvements coincided with Marx authorship of his regressive anti-Semitic rant. Marx intellectual treatise, along with the theories of such luminaries as Charles Darwin and other so-called enlightenment philosophers, contributed to a virtual

cottage industry of anti-Semitic articles and books in Europe. The anti-Semitic and anti-capitalist political theories and conspiratorial positions promulgated by Marx would add fuel to the emergence of the racist anti-Semitism that would serve as the core belief of Nazism in the 20th Century.

Darwin was not an anti-Semite but his theory of biological random selection, a theory of superior breeding, contributed to the late 19th Century emergence of scientific racism. The more positive aspects of the enlightenment, those aspects that were primarily influenced by the American Revolution and were unleashed into Europe by the more positive aspects of the French Revolution, led to many of the reforms that would serve as a genuinely progressive counterweight to the regressive conspiracy theory that constituted Marxism. One of those positive and genuinely progressive developments was the emancipation of the Jews of Europe.

Napoleon Bonaparte played a significant role in the emancipation of the Jews both in France and in the parts of Europe that he either conquered or controlled through family connections. In 1799, the year before Napoleon became head of state in France, he led a French military expedition into Egypt where he also attempted to conquer Palestine from the Ottoman Turks. During his siege of the old Crusader port of Acre, Napoleon issued a proclamation recognizing a Jewish State. The Turks repulsed his forces. Napoleon nevertheless had effectively launched modern Zionism decades before Austrian journalist Theodor Herzl convened the First Zionist Congress in Basel Switzerland in 1897. At the height of his power, Napoleon re-convened for the first time in well over millennia a Jewish Sanhedrin in order for French Jewish religious and secular leaders to find a legally sanctioned means to homogenize Jewish law with that of the French Empire.

Napoleon advanced progressive ideas that would apply not only to the Jews of Europe but to all Europeans who were inspired by the American example and these included the development of constitutional government and a middle class. Europe was emerging from feudalism and its accompanying rigid hereditary class system and entering into an era that advanced individual rights through institutions of freedom such as small business and private property ownership. The mid-19th century, the post Napoleonic era, was a period of relative peace and cooperation in Europe, an era that developed after the 1815 Treaty of Vienna and the final defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo. This era, known as the Concert of Europe, was a time that experienced the growth of freedom in Europe. This period lasted until the 1914 outbreak of World War I. This was a time of emerging individual entrepreneurship invention and increasing prosperity. Marx and his secretive cells of revolutionaries deliberately conspired to stop this trend.

This book examines the text of *On the Jewish Question* in the

context of the times in which it was written and this book traces its influence on hyper-nationalism, political and racial anti-Semitism and on the Nazi and Communist socialist experiments. We will examine the controversial subject of the influence of *On the Jewish Question* on the thinking and actions of Hitler and the Nazis by juxtaposing Marx ideas with those of Hitler and we will do so without apology or equivocation. We will examine the enduring overt as well as covert influence that *On the Jewish Question* has had on the left from the time it was published until the 1917 Bolshevik coup in Russia and on into our own times. An understanding of both the anti-Semitism and the philosophy contained within Marx chestnut of hate offers insights into the orientation of several political and social movements that continue to enslave the minds and souls of people and entire nations.

On the Jewish Question illustrates the stereotypes that Marx applied to the Jews, stereotypes that, once internalized, have in our own time taken the form of prejudice against conservatives, conservative Christians, private owners of property, those who believe in objective moral standards, those who support limited government, and private institutions, businesses and corporations. The left today uses the term "corporate interests" for example, in the same way that leftists in previous generations might have used the term "Jewish interests." Marx was clearly the primary promoter of modern intellectual and scientific anti-Semitism as, along with other enlightenment figures, he contributed to the left-wing perception of Jews and of the State of Israel today. His political ideas also contributed to the development of the pseudo-scientific biological and racial anti-Semitism that would lead to the Nazi Holocaust.

While voluminous evidence suggests that Marx was an inveterate anti-Semite, it is also true that his background was Jewish and that he was descended from a long line of distinguished rabbinic scholars on both his fathers and mothers side. Marx father, who converted to Christianity, was a supporter of the French left. Marx middle class Jewish background raises the often-discussed issue of why so many Jews were attracted to what would become the communist revolutionary faith and are, to varying degrees, attracted to elements of it to this day. Another question is to what degree did Talmudic Judaism, with its highly legalistic debating methodology, influenced Marx and his works, if at all and how that influence might affect the style of discourse of the left today. Marx often wrote, in Talmudic style, in response to his contemporary thinkers as *On the Jewish Question* was written as a response to Bruno Bauer's *The Jewish Question*.

The exacting and intricate Talmudic methodology, seemingly embraced by Marx stripped of a belief in God and the moral code of Sinai, led to the amoral and situational tactic of rhetoric and argument that remains a hallmark of the strategy and the approach to politics of the left today. The Talmud itself is a study in how to be a righteous person and how to approach a level of

understanding regarding the divine truths of the Torah. Any use of Talmudic methodology by the likes of Marx would effectively turn the Talmud on its head and should be viewed as heresy. Usage of Talmudic methodology by the left is comparable to comparing Catholic rituals to satanic practices because Satanists might employ the trappings of Catholic practices in their own rituals.

Most controversial of all the topics we shall touch upon is the extremely sensitive and easily misunderstood question of how Marx, who was identified in the public mind as a Jew, and other prominent European Jews and former Jews might have inadvertently contributed to the rise of anti-Semitism in post World War I Europe due to their public association with communism. This question might lend some insight into the controversial question of how a public embrace of communism on the part of many Jews was used to fuel the anti-Semitism of Nazism and the Nazi Holocaust. Many prominent former Jews, people not unlike Marx himself, would later become highly visible figures in the Russian Bolshevik regime at the height of its most atrocious brutalities and genocidal practices.

Many people who were associated in the minds of Europeans as Jews were involved in some of the worst aspects of those brutalities. Europeans took notice of this and the Nazis exploited it by weaving it into their demented conspiracy theories against all Jews. The Nazis employed black propaganda in their diabolical program of annihilation of 6 million innocent Jews who had nothing to do with Bolshevik communism. One of the greatest tragedies of the Holocaust, besides of course the fact that 6 million innocent people were murdered at the hands of the socialist Nazi regime, was the fact that the vast majority of Jews utterly rejected communism and that Judaism itself, as a faith, was and remains diametrically opposed to the ideas contained within communism.

The various so-called anti-social traits that Marx assigned to the Jews in his book, traits that many on the left view as negative, are in fact traits that are natural to the human being. These are traits of the human character that are normal and are appropriate to the fostering of human freedom and a healthy and free society. Those same human traits, assigned by Marx to the Jews, are the positive traits that have made America a successful democracy. The endeavor of a moral society is not to eliminate, or to *disintegrate* these traits, as this would result in the eradication of the most essential aspects of the human being.

Such an endeavor would, at any rate, be impossible since human nature cannot be eradicated unless the human being is killed. The moral society seeks to encourage those characteristics in a manner that is directed toward self-improvement and toward the voluntary general improvement of the community. The practical result of the internalization of Marxist ideas pertaining to Jews, and by extension to all freedom loving people and nations, has

led many on the left to embrace an undigested form of political conditioning and an inherent dislike for the political culture of America. Many on the left thus hate everything that America stands for. More fundamentally, and as a result of this unnatural ideology, many on the left have come to hate humanity itself and they hate themselves.

The origins of Marxist anti-Semitism

To understand the milieu of Karl Marx and his times it is instructive to briefly review the origins of the movement that would give birth to Communism. Marx was only one of a long line of modern revolutionaries as the modern communist movement was set into motion in a burst of blood and violence during the height of the French Revolution of 1789-1799. French revolutionist and pamphleteer Restif de la Bretonne is the first revolutionary known to have used the term Communism and it was Francois-Noel Babeuf, known as Gracchus Babeuf, who first used the term publically to describe his movement in 1795 during his attempted coup against the conservative Thermidorian French government that had been established as a reaction to the 1793-1794 Reign of Terror. The proto-communist government that presided over the Reign of Terror, like most communist regimes that were to follow, ended with rivers of blood and unprecedented levels of repression. The Reign of Terror culminated with the perpetrators, the radical Jacobins including the Jacobin dictator Maximilien Robespierre with their heads chopped off by the guillotines that they had kept humming for a year as they beheaded those who they deemed to have been enemies of the revolution. (1.)

The French people wanted conservative revolution that would resemble the American Revolution of 1776. The American Revolution was conservative in the sense that it was motivated by the colonist's desire to re-assert and to thus "conserve" the rights and the privileges that they had come to expect before those rights were usurped by the British Parliament and King George III. The British committed many usurpations including taking away the colonists currency and replacing it with Bank of England notes resulting in inflation. For the first time the colonists experienced unemployment scarcity and poverty. The British also levied taxes on the colonies in an arbitrary manner, restricted trade, and denied to the colonists access to settle west of the Appalachians. By declaring their independence from Britain, the Americans preserved and in the real sense "conserved" that which they understood to be their natural rights as citizens. During the American Revolution Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, and Benjamin Franklin served as diplomats in Paris and their presence in France had a profound and positive influence on the French.

The French Declaration of Rights, as issued by the National Assembly in 1789, reflected aspects of the philosophy and values

of the American Declaration of Independence and the US Constitution. The more radical French Constitution, which superseded the original after the 1793 execution of French King Louis XVI, called for common happiness as opposed to the American Declaration of Independence which called for the pursuit of happiness. The French Constitution stated that oppression against the body of society was grounds for rebellion. Thus, the focus of the French Constitution was to champion the rights of the so-called collective however this was to be defined. To support this France would require an authoritarian system while the Americans established the opposite, a balance of power as a means to limit its concentration. The American Constitution preserved and protected the natural rights of the individual.

The Jacobin subversion of the French Revolution originated in Munich Germany where, at the University of Ingolstadt on May 1, 1776, the same year as America's independence, Adam Weishaupt, a professor of Canon Law, established a secret society known as the Order of the Illuminati. May 1, May Day, is thus observed as a holiday by socialists and communists. The history of the Illuminati is considered settled in Europe but is virtually unknown in the United States. Because of its secrecy, and because much is still not known and will probably never be known about the Illuminati, an examination of the topic must be handled with care and with a solid reliance on the little information that is available. (2.)

In 1773, Pope Clement XIV suppressed the Society of Jesus, the secretive Catholic priestly order known as the Jesuits. A Jesuit priest had held the office of Canon Law Professor at Ingolstadt University and, after the temporary suppression of the Jesuits by the Pope; the position went to Weishaupt who proceeded to establish, along with four of his associates, his secret society. Harkening back to pre-Christian Greco-Roman mythology, Weishaupt adopted the name of Spartacus to mark the occasion. The use of ancient Greek and Roman names became customary for Illuminists as well as for secretive left-wing revolutionaries. This was why the French revolutionist, the self-described communist Babeuf, adapted the name of Gracchus.

Weishaupt modeled his secret society, the Order of the Illuminati, after the Jesuit order absent the Catholic belief in God and without the Christian moral code. The Jesuits, who to this day maintain an honored and admirable network of colleges and academic institutions in Europe and North America, had developed a network of spies across Catholic Europe in the employ of the Catholic Church. While Weishaupt emulated the Jesuits in form, he replaced the moral mission of the Jesuits with the earthly mission of establishing an international secular dictatorship. Weishaupt developed a network of spies across the German speaking countries. The primary vehicle for accomplishing this was the infiltration by the Illuminati of the conservative network of Masonic lodges of Germany and perhaps those beyond Germany. (3.)

The immediate purpose of the Illuminati, known initially by various names including the "enlightened," the "Order of the Perfectibilists" or the "bees" was to abolish the monarchies and the religions of Europe and the colonies. Weishaupt was influenced by, among others, German philosopher and rationalist thinker Christian Wolff who developed a system of placing almost everything that could be named into a scientific sounding category. One idea that animated the enlightenment was that scientific advancement was leading humanity into an era in which war and suffering would end.

The theory was that humanity, after solving all problems through science, would enter into a perpetual era of perfection and universal utopia. The Polish astronomer Nicolas Copernicus theory that the earth revolved around the sun, Isaac Newton's theory of gravity, and other important scientific discoveries had moved many enlightenment thinkers away from belief in the supernatural and in the direction of atheistic materialism and humanism. Scientific knowledge served as a narcotic when encountering the mind of a certain type of thinker who also retained regressive vestiges of the authoritarian mindset. Science, which is a positive force of knowledge in and of itself, one that is capable of affecting positive change in the human condition, would thus be subverted to serve as a cover for unscientific ideas and unproven social theories.

The Illuminati reflected utopian views and were clearly outside the realm of science, a belief that entities such as organized religion, sovereign nation-states, and belief in God, private property, marriage, conventional morality, and individual freedom were manufactured ideas and were therefore obstacles that stood in the way of the new and utopian scientific society. They believed in sweeping aside the old social order and replacing it with a new Europe and eventually a new world order under the secular scientific rule of a benevolent and enlightened dictatorship. The intention was for the Illuminati, which was a secret society engaged in occult practices and that which was made up of wealthy people and intellectuals, to spread to various European capitals where its members would quietly staff the governments and institutions of Europe and eventually those of the world. (4.)

Weishaupt worked toward creating a new social order in which a collectivized man would live in harmony with nature and would no longer require what he considered to be the artifices of faith and government. Weishaupt sought to use the power of existing government toward that ultimate end and, as such, he sought to replace existing governments with his own cadre of colleagues and followers who would quietly attain positions of influence deriving support from the growing network of Illuminati cells. The method he advocated for attaining this objective was a combination of terrorism, coordinated social unrest as a means of destabilizing and confusing the targeted society and high-level

government intrigue. Amidst the planned chaos and anarchy, members of the Illuminati, with their association shrouded in secrecy, would ride in on the proverbial white horse to save the day.

The poison and the antidote would thus be created in the same laboratory. (5.) In 1777, a year after the founding of the Illuminati, Weishaupt was initiated into the Masonic lodge "Theodor zum guten Rath" at Munich Bavaria. Evidence exists to suggest that the Illuminati proceeded to infiltrate much of the already well-established and generally conservative infrastructure of Freemasonry in Germany. The degree to which Weishaupt and his organization were successful is not entirely known and will never likely be known given the secrecy of both the Illuminati and Freemasonry. The Freemasons generally embraced the more positive aspects of the enlightenment, individual rights and the Judeo-Christian moral code. Masonic lodges played an important and indeed a laudatory role in the American Revolution.

The Illuminati was banned by Karl Theodore the Elector of Bavaria in 1784, after a courier carrying papers meant to be delivered to an Illuminati cell, papers that indicated a plot was afoot against the European states and which revealed the seditious nature of the secret society, were intercepted by Bavarian authorities and thus the Illuminati was exposed. Weishaupt, having been banished from his native Bavaria as a result, spent the rest of his life under surveillance as a court councilor to Duke Ernst of the Duchy of Gotha where he died in 1811. While in exile Weishaupt wrote *A Complete History of the Persecutions of the Illuminati in Bavaria* (1785), *A Picture of Illuminism* (1786), *An Apology for the Illuminati* (1786), and *An Improved System of Illuminism* (1787).

The most authoritative source connecting the Illuminati to the French secret society, the Jacobins, an organization that was behind the Reign of Terror that co-opted the French Revolution is a series of four volumes entitled *Memoirs Illustrating the History of Jacobinism* by Jesuit priest Augustin Barruel, 1741-1820. The basic premise of this classic and widely disseminated work, published in 1798-1799, was that the Reign of Terror was the project of various secret societies including the Illuminati and that the Jacobins were the prime movers behind the subversion of the French Revolution. Barruel included in his books what were purported to be replicas of the papers confiscated in Bavaria that led to the banning of the Illuminati. Barruel accurately wrote about the influence of various philosophers, particularly François-Marie Arouet, known as Voltaire, and Jean Jacques Rousseau. There is little question that these two enlightenment philosophers influenced the undermining of Christianity in favor of the authoritarian power of the state as a vehicle of transformation and redemption.

This author believes that Barruel went too far in linking these

two philosophers to the Jacobin conspiracy and agrees with the critics of Barruel who contend that his attempt to draw a literal connection between the Illuminati of Adam Weishaupt and the Jacobin clubs was insufficient. The relevant and non-controversial issue covered by Barruel is the principles of the Illuminati, which were public after its exposure, were virtually the same as those of the Jacobins and other secretive groups who subverted the French Revolution. The philosophers, along with anti-French leaders such as the Prussian King Frederick II, and various anti-Catholic groups all played a role in supporting the Jacobin conspiracy but for their own and often divergent reasons. Many conservative enlightenment philosophers from the British school, particularly John Locke and Thomas Hobbs but also French philosopher Baron de Montesquieu and later Frederic Bastiat played a positive role in the American and French Revolutions and the aftermath.

The influence of the American Revolution of 1776 on the French Revolution, launched thirteen years later with the July 14, 1789 storming of the Bastille, is a factor that is underrated by historians. It is contended here that the 1789 French Revolution was an organic movement influenced by the American Revolution and that the 1793-1795 Reign of Terror was a conspiracy to circumvent that influence. France supported American independence from Britain militarily politically and financially. The Marquis de Lafayette, who would go on to play a conservative role in the French Revolution, aided General George Washington and the French Navy hemmed in the British Army of General Charles Cornwallis at Yorktown by sea so that Washington could successfully lay siege by land. Washington's victory at Yorktown, which led to the surrender of the British forces on October 19, 1781, would not have been possible without the assistance of the French navy that achieved its one and only naval victory against the British at the Battle of the Chesapeake shortly before the Yorktown engagement.

The American Republic restored and broadened natural rights over time. Thus the Americans, who were revolutionary in the true meaning of the word, would view rights as endowed by the creator and that self-evident rights included the right to own property, to vote for representatives to a legislature, the right to self-determination, the right to engage in trade, the right of the government to issue currency and all of the rights associated with liberty. These conservative values view government not as an authority that grants rights by artifice and whim, but rather as a means to protect inherent rights. Thomas Jefferson believed that rights were self-evident and that rights came from nature and nature's God and not from an authoritarian state. The illuminists and their followers sought to subvert those rights while claiming to stand for freedom.

The intoxicating whiff of liberty wafted across the Atlantic and into old Europe where the agenda of the so-called progressives, the European Illuminati and their camp followers felt threatened

as genuine liberty always threatens any plot to change human nature by force and subterfuge. Much of the old aristocracy of Europe was open to the idea of ceding power to elected bodies and to the people and to the development of constitutional monarchies. A constitutional monarchy, a modest and conservative development in Europe, was exactly what the French people desired when they supported the Revolution of 1789. Instead, their popular but hapless King Louis XVI and his aristocratic wife Marie Antoinette got the guillotine, an event that is still celebrated by the left. The royal couple was replaced by the most brutal and totalitarian government Europe had ever experienced up until that point. The Jacobins launched the world's first communist experiment and it was replete with all of the same propaganda and jargon, claims to enlightened reason and science, that every subsequent communist movement and government would imitate almost verbatim.

Abbe Barruel claimed that a few days after the July 14, 1789 storming of the Bastille, Illuminati influenced Masonic lodges were declaring their secret slogan on the streets of Paris and that Trinitarian slogan was "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity."^(6.) The admirable term Liberty reflected the ideal of the American Revolution but the term Equality reflects the opposite, what would become the ideal of the Socialist movement of Europe that would give birth to the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia in 1917. Equality implies a system in which all of mankind would be de-facto equal. Karl Marx refined the concept with his slogan "from each according to his ability to each according to his need." Such an artificial condition of equality would and did require perpetual war and repression which was to be enacted until mankind was ready for the day of redemption.

The American conception of equality is equal justice under the law. In America, the individual is sovereign and the fruit of his achievement is his own. The American principle of equality is de jure as opposed to de facto. This means that the laws of the land are in theory applied equally to all. Thomas Jefferson wrote about this principle when he referred to America as a nation of laws and not of men. The American system recognized that each human being is unique and is therefore different, with different skills and with different abilities, and that each individual is entitled to equal justice under the law. Concomitantly, Jefferson echoed the biblical concept that men and women were created in the image of God by declaring that all men are created equal. This would run contrary to the Marxist and Darwinian idea that men and women were not equal but existed on different rungs of the social or biological scale.

The American system is analogous to the rules of football. There are rules that apply equally to the two competing teams. Once the rules have been established the teams are then free to compete in any way they choose. The American system is certainly imperfect and as such, it is a reflection of the imperfect nature of the human being and of human existence. Thus, the

American approach to government is a reflection of the naturally imperfect and actually existing state of humanity.

The idea of Fraternity, the third part of the French revolutionary slogan, would develop into the branch of socialism that would inspire Nazism. Fraternity implies the promotion of one fraternal group over others, whether that group is based upon race, ethnic, linguistic or religious ties. The fraternity supporters viewed fraternity from the prism of government policy. In America private families maintain natural degrees of fraternal ties and some private organizations encourage voluntary fraternity among like-minded individuals. Both equality, the philosophy of Communism, and fraternity, the philosophy of Nazism, stand opposed to liberty. Liberty promotes the natural rights of the individual over the group, of limited government over force, and of free choice and the free market over the centralized control required to enact the unnatural prerogatives of equality and fraternity.

The equality oriented left today utilizes the term progressive to describe their equality oriented movement but the euphemism "progressive" does not elaborate upon what progress they have in mind or whether their beliefs are progressive. This is like a group calling itself the "love" party or "chicken in every pot." In its proper context the term progressive is the Socialist advocacy for a strong central government run by an enlightened dictatorship that is moving humanity toward world totalitarianism. The progressive seeks to transfer rights from the individual, the property owner, the private business, and the private corporation to the state. The underlying principle at play is that the alleged enlightened elite know better than the average citizen in terms of how to live, how to think, and how to conduct business.

The Jacobins and their communist heirs represent a regression harkening back to the total rule of the Egyptian Pharaoh. The Jacobins were indeed more regressive and authoritarian than any European monarch had ever dared to be. The Jacobins introduced a system of government that exercised a level of immorality, brutality and total control the degree to which had not existed since ancient collectivist times. Europe would not get another taste of Jacobinism until Lenin led the Bolsheviks in the 1917 communist coup in Russia and until Hitler launched the reaction to Lenin and Stalin in 1933. The Jacobins launched a revolutionary tradition that animated Bolshevik equality in Russia and Nazi fraternity in Germany. This author contends that the liberty of America represents true progress which stands in stark contrast to the so-called progressives.

The Jacobins established tactics that remain standard to the equality and fraternity cult and no example is more typical than the denunciation of the King Louis XVI. The French monarch, who was quite moderate and popular, was open to reform and to ceding power to the French National Assembly and did so. Louis

had supported the American Revolution with money and he was a popular figure in the new American Republic. The city of Louisville Kentucky is named in his honor. Louis got into trouble for the same reason that many of today's leaders get into trouble, he ran up a deficit to pay for an increase in bureaucracy and to aid the American Revolution. He tried to do this without raising taxes and he was not entirely forthcoming when he was faced with the resulting inflation and budgetary crisis.

Louis XVI, in typical fashion, was smeared by the Jacobins as a tyrant and as oppressive and they attacked his wife as an elitist. Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette were portrayed by the revolutionaries as people of great wealth while the countryside allegedly was starving. The economic propaganda meant that the King, or the wealthy class, were wealthy because they had somehow exploited the poor. The materialist view was that money was a finite commodity and that therefore money should be distributed equally. The truth is that money is as infinite and as abstract an expression of human accomplishment and value as is the human imagination and is an expression of production and a storage of value. Besides, France was not starving as; on the contrary, France was one of the most prosperous nations in the world at the time.

If the premise that wealth is finite were true than the French royal couple, by being wealthy, would be withholding money from the poor and this would mean that, due to this fact, they bore at least partial responsibility for poverty. This false and materialist premise remains a core belief of the left today and is part of the reason why progressives call for a re-distribution of wealth. With this theory in mind, it was not much of a leap to portray the royal couple as deliberately cruel and callous toward the suffering of the poor simply because they were not poor. The revolutionary conspirators, who no so ironically counted as among their own ranks an inordinate number of the most wealthy and who depended upon wealthy benefactors, singled out Louis and his wife in a propaganda campaign. With scorn and derision heaped upon their heads, poor Louis and Marie underwent the unimaginable horror of having their heads chopped off by the guillotine in a public ceremony.

Meanwhile the Jacobins did the work of stirring up the countryside by convincing enough Frenchmen that they were somehow exploited if they owned less than their neighbor. The Jacobin propaganda campaign of greed and envy, appealing to the dark side of human nature, sought to replace the Catholic Church with earth worship and paganism. All of this belied the fact that France was developing a middle class. The general model was followed by Lenin in Russia culminating in the Bolshevik coup of 1917. Czar Nicholas II attempted, ineptly and too slowly, to institute reforms in Russia yet he was also portrayed as a wealthy tyrant in spite of signs of the emergence of a middle class and moves toward freedom. Mao tse Tung used the same demonization strategy in China and Fidel Castro did it

in Cuba as did every other communist conspiracy.

In every case, without exception, the communists would visit upon their respective nations an unprecedented level of oppression poverty disease and death. The French Revolution itself was an entirely peaceful affair. In response to an economic crisis precipitated by too much government borrowing and spending, including spending on the American Revolution and on other foreign adventures followed by an unpopular tax increase, Louis called for the reconvening of the ancient Estates-General, a governing body that had not been called into session since 1614. On June of 1789, the newly convened Estates-General declared a National Assembly and Louis became a constitutional monarch.

This was the French Revolution and it was peaceful. These reforms were not enough for the Jacobins and their secret society allies as well as nations intriguing to undermine French interests. Thus, a few weeks after the peaceful convening of the national assembly, July 14, 1789, the conspirators staged one of the most famous marketing events in history, an event known as the storming of the Bastille. The Bastille was a prison that contained within its walls only seven non-political prisoners who were freed. Following the staged event, France was wracked by several years of planned agitation on the street and by government overreaction until the government and the populace had reached such a point of fear and exhaustion that they begged for order. In marched the Reign of Terror.

These were the prevailing conditions in the decades leading up to Marx release his anti-Semitic diatribe in 1843. Napoleon, who restored order after the Reign of Terror and who suppressed the Jacobin communists, achieved much in Europe until he was defeated in 1814. The 1815 Treaty of Vienna, ending Napoleon's militant expansionism, established the peace of the Concert of Europe. In subsequent decades the great nation-states of Europe emerged from the remnants of Middle Ages feudalism where small states had been owned by hereditary dynasties and handed down to heirs. During those decades Germany and Italy united and the European states, particularly Britain and France, reached their apex of world influence through trade and colonialism.

Yet the regressive Illuminati inspired communist propagandists and agitators, who had largely retreated into secretive cells during the period of Napoleonic rule, remained as active as ever. The conspirators continued to agitate, to issue propaganda, and to launch campaigns of insurrection, assassination, and terrorism. The main ideological weapon of the revolutionaries, a weapon that served as the keystone for Karl Marx and would serve such revolutionary figures as Hitler, Lenin, Stalin and Mao, was that their authoritarian ideas constituted 'science. They discovered that once they affixed the term "science" to their programs, the opposition would be neutralized as they would be declared as against "science" and therefore against truth. This

tactic made it easier for political enlightenment dictators such as Lenin and Hitler to liquidate their opposition or, to use a term employed by Marx, the opposition would be *made impossible*.

Karl Marx constantly referred to "science" when espousing his political theories including those that he devised with regard to the Jews. This gave his work a sense of legitimacy as the "science" propaganda pertaining to his theories reverberated into the culture. At the same time, the propaganda line suggested that such institutions as religion property and family were not scientific but were, to use another term employed by Marx, forms of *false consciousness*. The same scientific marketing campaign heralded the grandiose arrivals of Darwin's Theory of Evolution, Freud's theory of polymorphous perversity, and Hitler's race theories. All of these ideas were launched as enlightenment programs in their day and some of those programs remain as integral to the cultural firmament, as accepted as absolute faith and honored in the canon of received wisdom.

Was Marx an anti-Semite? Was Marx a Jew? Both of his parents were descended from distinguished Jewish Rabbis. His father, who had changed his name from Herschel ha Levi Marx to Heinrich Marx, was descended from Rabbi Eleazar ha-Levi of Mainz. Heinrich Marx became a Lutheran along with his wife, born Henrietta (nee) Pressburg and they baptized their six children on August 26, 1824, six years after Marx was born in Rhineland Prussia in 1818. Marx had an uneventful middle class upbringing steeped in the French influenced radical enlightenment tradition. It has been reported that Marx father was a real eighteenth century "Frenchman" who knew Voltaire and Rousseau inside out. Marx was confirmed as a Christian and he apparently took Christianity very seriously for a time in his youth. (5.) Indeed, Marx wrote a tract about the significance of his belief in Jesus Christ before entering college. Like so many young college students then and ever since, Marx entered college a believing Christian and left a hardened atheist.

Marx wrote vicious anti-Semitic and racist slurs in letters describing German socialist Ferdinand Lasalle. In a letter to Frederick Engels, he referred to Lasalle as Baron Itzig, the Jewish Nigger, and as a greasy Jew disguised under brilliantine and cheap jewels. Writing to his partner and financial benefactor, the capitalist industrialist Friedrich Engels, July 30, 1862, Marx wrote of Lasalle that *It is now perfectly clear to me that the shape of his head and the growth of his hair indicates he is descended from the Negroes who joined in Moses flight from Egypt (unless his mother or grandmother on his father's side was crossed with a nigger). This union of Jew and German on a Negro base was bound to produce an extraordinary hybrid.* Marx was angry with Lasalle for not lending him money. This was also the case with the Bamberger father and son, who also loaned him money from time to time and who Marx referred to as Jew Bamberger and little Jew Bamberger in published letters to

Engels. (6.) In letters to Engels, Marx referred to Jew Spielmann and he described in a letter to Engels a resort he was visiting in Ramsgate as containing many Jews and fleas.

While Marx made crude anti-Semitic references in his private correspondences, references that lend insight into his frame of thinking, he wrote other published anti-Semitic tracts besides *On the Jewish Question*, tracts that have left a profound legacy on his followers. One of those tracts was the lesser known and less influential tract known as *The Holy Family* published in 1845, an essay that was written shortly after *On the Jewish Question* that was also a response to the writings of fellow revolutionary Bruno Bauer and his more radical brother Edgar Bauer. In that essay Marx wrote, in commentary on his own previous work, that he had proved that the task of abolishing the essence of Jewry is the task of abolishing Jewry in civil society which would abolish the inhumanity of today's practice of life the summit of which was the money system.

Get it? Marx wrote that by abolishing Judaism, mankind would abolish the inhumanity of today's practice of life. In other words, Judaism represented for Marx the font of inhumanity in society. His proof of this hateful lie was the false and ugly conspiracy theory that the Jews secretly controlled what he called the money system; an alleged system that he contended was evil. I would challenge the reader to find a tract written by Hitler that was more anti-Semitic than this. Like Hitler, Marx presented what he considered to be a justification for abolishing Judaism.

A tract that could be cited as an example of Marx anti-Semitism is an article he wrote for the *New York Daily Tribune*, published on January 4, 1856 entitled *The Russian Loan*. In that article Marx wrote: *Thus, we find every tyrant backed by a Jew, as is every pope by a Jesuit. In truth, the cravings of oppressors would be hopeless, and the practicability of war out of the question, if there were not an army of Jesuits to smother thought and a handful of Jews to ransack pockets.*

This view, dripping as it was with scathing hatred, a hatred that was by no means unique to Marx, was a reiteration of the classic Jewish conspiracy theory that the Jews secretly ran governments and were responsible for war due to their alleged financial power and apparently, according to Marx, were operating in at least an informal alliance with the Jesuits. Perhaps he thought this sort of thing would appeal to his American readers, as America in those years was rife with anti-Catholic sentiment. The article was written seven years after the publication of *The Communist Manifesto* which had turned Marx into an international socialist superstar, a revered figure within international revolutionary socialist circles. Thus, when Marx transmitted these old and ugly anti-Semitic conspiracy theories he gave them a new and scientific sounding imprimatur.

By this means Marx established the enduring left-wing conspiratorial view of politics and life. Indeed, the analysis of the

left on politics, culture, economy and almost every human endeavor is based upon the premise of conspiracy. Nothing is as it appears to the leftist as the truth is always hidden. Only conspiracy explains events and the average leftist, like Marx himself, believes he possesses the keenness of mind to know exactly what that conspiracy is. This author has witnessed this in action as leftist friends have come up with the most bizarre conspiracy theories, utterly unconnected to a shred of evidence, to explain almost anything. This is not to say that conspiracies, both political and criminal, do not exist as such a contention would be naive. Only that conspiratorial analysis must be conducted carefully and with solid evidence to back it up. The motives and background of the presenter must also be fully revealed in order for the theory to have any legitimacy.

The generic left-wing conspiracy premise is that “exploiters” are behind almost everything that occurs in life where there exists some imbalance or where things are not exactly equal. The exploiters thus conspire to “exploit” their fellow man out of greed and lust for power. The entire conspiratorial edifice rests upon the sandy foundational assumption that ultimately nothing is real, that nothing is true, that everything is manufactured by the “exploiters” for the purpose of “exploitation.” Ironically, or perhaps not so ironically, it has been the Marxists who, once in power, have exploited their own people by confiscating their property and therefore their freedom, and by expropriating the property and freedom of their neighbors through war and subversion.

Marx article *The Russian Loan* continued: *The real work is done by the Jews, and can only be done by them, as they monopolize the machinery of the lone mongering mysteries by concentrating their energies on the barter trade in securities.*

This echoes a uniquely Marxist contribution to the anti-Semitic lexicon, a contribution that Marx had introduced over a decade earlier in *On the Jewish Question*. The claim that the Jews controlled a monopoly over the machinery of the lone mongering mysteries implies Marx earlier and more bizarre implication that characteristics such as self-interest and huckstering were uniquely Jewish traits that would dissolve from civil society and human consciousness if the world were emancipated from the Jews. Thus, in *On the Jewish Question*, Marx wrote: *An organization of society which would abolish the preconditions for huckstering, and therefore the possibility of huckstering, would make the Jew impossible.*

Continuing with *The Russian Loan*: *Here and there and everywhere that a little capital courts investment, there is ever one of these little Jews ready to make a little suggestion or place a little bit of a loan. The smartest highwayman in the Abruzzi is not better posted up about the locale of the hard cash in a travelers valise or pocket than those Jews about any loose capital in the hands of a trader...the language spoken smells strongly of Babel, and the perfume which otherwise pervades the place is by*

no means of a choice kind.

This is an ugly and disgusting example of Marx sheer and unadulterated anti-Semitism and this is Jew hatred at its most basic. This suggests a hatred for Jews on the part of Marx that would be analogous to anything that could be gleaned from Hitler's text in Mein Kampf. Why Marx hated his own ancestry so intensely will never be known and is not important. The issue here is the extent to which this anti-Semitism, coming from the public pronouncements of the most prominent revolutionary leader of his time and since, influenced future revolutionary movements including that of the Nazis.

The Russian Loan continues: ... Thus do these loans, which are a curse to the people, a ruin to the holders, and a danger to the governments, become a blessing to the children of Judah. This Jew organization of loan-mongers is as dangerous to the people as the aristocratic organization of landowners... The fortunes amassed by these loan-mongers are immense, but the wrongs and the sufferings thus entailed on the people and the encouragement thus afforded to their oppressors still remains to be told.

It is fair to criticize specific institutions of merchant capital and their practices as well as to criticize their possibly corrupting influence on governments but such criticism would miss the point in this case. Marx specifically and quite libelously tied in the Jewish people with merchant banking when Jews made up only a small percentage of the government lenders to which Marx referred. What Marx also ignored was the good works and the social advancement that resulted from the ability of bankers to offer large loans to government and industry. There certainly were abuses and these abuses continue but to condemn an entire endeavor is wrong and to tie that condemnation in specifically with the Jews is a damn lie. For the record, most merchant bankers and investors do not happen to be Jewish not that it would matter if they were. Marx himself lived off other people's money all his life starting with an inheritance from his father. Perhaps his attitude toward those who offer loans was a guilty expression of his own resentment over his own failure to make a living.

Concluding The Russian Loan: The fact that 1855 years ago Christ drove the Jewish moneychangers out of the temple, and that the moneychangers of our age enlisted on the side of tyranny happen again chiefly to be Jews, is perhaps no more than a historical coincidence. The loan-mongering Jews of Europe do only on a larger and more obnoxious scale what many others do on one smaller and less significant. But it is only because the Jews are so strong that it is so timely and expedient to expose and stigmatize their organization.

Marx was radically anti-religious and he was not above resurrecting an old Christian anti-Semitic canard, for marketing

purposes, in order to make his case that the Jews were dominant in banking and that this was a bad thing. The fact that the merchant bankers Marx so despised provided much of the capital that helped to develop the infrastructure of Europe and America was the underlying factor in why Marx sought to stigmatize them. He believed that control of finance and credit, and property and business, should be held by the state, or by the dictatorship of the proletariat. Thus Marx viewed private capital in the same light as he viewed any private entity. He viewed the growing private sector as an impediment to his collectivist view, as an enemy of *public ownership of the means of production*. (7.)

Perhaps *Origin of Species*, by Charles Darwin 1859, influenced Marx anti-Semitism as Darwinism would later influence Hitler. Like most revolutionaries, Marx admired Darwin and his theory on the evolution of the races or the "species." Marx, who was Darwin's contemporary, adapted Darwin's biological theory of evolving species into his political and social theory of evolving societies. Engels, while eulogizing Marx at his funeral wrote: *Just as Darwin discovered the law of evolution in organic nature, so Marx discovered the law of evolution in human history; he discovered the simple fact, hitherto concealed by an overgrowth of ideology, that mankind must first of all eat and drink, have shelter and clothing, before it can pursue politics, religion, science, art, etc.; and that therefore the production of the immediate material means of subsistence, and consequently the degree of economic development attained by a given people or during a given epoch, form the foundation upon which State institutions, the legal conceptions, the art, and even the religious ideas of the people concerned, have been evolved, and in the light of which these things must be explained, instead of vice versa as had hitherto been the case.* (8.) Marx wanted to dedicate his second volume of his magnum opus *Capital* to Darwin but the naturalist refused the honor asserting that he felt he was not sufficiently knowledgeable in the area of economics. (9.)

Numerous quotes have been attributed to Marx that illustrate his vicious anti-Semitism and his loathing of Jews but the more damaging feature of his Jew hatred, the aspect that has had the most impact, was the nature of his overall contempt for religion in general with a special emphasis on Judaism. One of his most famous and often recited quotes regarding religion was *religion is the opiate of the people* and this quote was derived from his book *The Holy Family*. This book criticizes the Bauer brothers Edgar and Bruno in the form of a sneer that has been imitated by leftists ever since. Edgar Bauer played a role in introducing violence and terrorism as a tactic for revolutionaries to employ for social change.

Marx and Bruno Bauer were fellow Young Hegelians or left Hegelians. The left and right Hegelian movements followed German philosopher and Professor Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel. The most influential theme put forth by Hegel was the concept of the dialectic which held that everything in the

universe could be explained as possessing an opposite component, that those opposing components were engaged in a natural and ongoing collision course, and that the result of the collisions was a new paradigm. Hegel presented his formula as involving a thesis that was colliding with an antithesis resulting in a synthesis. Besides influencing Marx and the revolutionary movement, Hegel's ideas probably influenced Darwin who interpreted a dialectical clash in nature. Darwin's synthesis, after the dialectical process that he called random selection, would be a new and superior species or, in the case of humanity, a new and superior race.

The right Hegelians applied the dialectical process toward the further development of Christianity while the left Hegelians drew their inspiration from the communism and atheism that was launched during the French Revolution. The main philosophical contribution to the enlightenment on the part of Bruno Bauer, whose theories have been internalized by the secular world ever since, was the idea that Christianity was primarily a product of Greek mythology as opposed to as a product of Judaism and that the Bible was largely a myth. The anti-Semitic Bauer authored *The Jewish Question* and Marx responded with *On the Jewish Question*. Bauer blamed the Jews for European anti-Semitism by claiming that they had *made their own nest in the pores and intestines of bourgeois society*.

Bauer's attitude toward Jews was typical of the left Hegelians and of the developing communist movement in general. The position was that the so-called dialectical class conflict, the clash between the upper and lower economic classes was exemplified by the Jews who, according to both Bauer and Marx, represented the worst traits of the upper class. This identification of the Jews, mixed with the visceral hatred of Jews that was demonstrated by both the former Lutheran theologian Bauer and by Marx formed a lethal philosophical brew especially when put into the Marxian context of representing a political so-called science. Their so-called science greatly influenced the thinking and the pseudo-science of Adolf Hitler and his Hegelian oriented socialist Nazi cadre.

In his essay *The Jewish Question*, published in 1843, Bauer presented what would become a theorem of scientific enlightenment anti-Semitism that would be further magnified and popularized by Marx in his response to Bauer. Like Marx, Bauer felt that the emancipation of the Jews of Europe, initiated by Napoleon Bonaparte, posed as a threat to his authoritarian utopian political fantasy. Bauer presented a view that would resonate with Marx and his follower to this day and that view was that true emancipation for the Jews and for that matter the emancipation of Christians would require that they stop being Jews and Christians.

Bauer set the stage for Marx contention that religion was a form of false consciousness. Bauer assumed that the emancipation of

the Jews could only occur in a de-facto secular state, which is to say a state in which there would be no religion. Bauer's contention ran contrary to the American understanding of the secular state, which was a state in which religion thrived as a private yet intertwined institution and idea, one that would influence private as well as public morality and policy in the non-denominational sense, and that the American government would be secular in the de-jure sense as opposed to in the de-facto sense. As a counterpoise to the authoritarian position, Americans believe in de-jure equality or equal justice under the law as opposed to Marx who advocated for de-facto equality which is absolute equality enforced by the state or the so-called collective.

Bauer openly called for the outright and legal abolition of all religion. Leftist theoreticians in the future would take a more subtle approach. The trappings of religion, the ceremonies, the rituals, the stain glass windows and other external effects would be left in place while, stealthily and over time, belief in the divine, the belief in a fixed moral code as well as the philosophy of the faith would be stripped away. The so-called progressives would seek to replace traditional and conventional notions of morality and belief with their collectivist oriented secular science while leaving in place the sights and the sounds.

Marx adapted Hegel's dialectical theory into his political theory of dialectical materialism in a manner similar to that of naturalist Charles Darwin who employed dialectics as the central theme of his biological theory of evolution. Marx viewed the two opposite forces, the upper class or the Bourgeoisie and the lower class or the proletariat as in a state of eternal conflict, the clash between the thesis and the antithesis. The synthesis, the end result, according to Marx, would be a new and perfect society. The social evolution would go through various economic and social stages until the final utopian stage, the one Marx called Communism. Darwin applied the dialectical idea to his concept of the emergence of a superior species, which would occur, according to Darwin, because of the struggle between superior and inferior members of a given species and through a process of breeding, what Darwin called random selection.

The final and logical result of Darwin's theory would be the emergence or the evolution if you will, of a new and superior human species. While Marx believed that the final stage in human societal evolution would be the collectivized man living in perfect harmony with nature, Hitler adhered to a more literal biological interpretation of the same theme in his belief in the evolution of the Ubermensch or the Superman. Darwin perhaps differed from his two enlightenment colleagues only in that he did not foresee a final stage of the evolutionary process but only a process that would continue along ad infinitum.

Marx released his guided missiles against the newly emancipated Jews of Europe as well as against the emerging European middle class and the overall development of the institutions of freedom

that were emanating from the more positive and American influenced aspects of the enlightenment. The 1843 release of *On the Jewish Question* occurred 30 years after the peace of Vienna, a peace that marked the defeat of Napoleon at the Battle of Waterloo. Europe had made much progress in the ensuing decades in terms of capital accumulation, genuine enlightenment and the emergence of individual rights.

Yet Marx was right in 1848 when he stated in the opening line of *The Communist Manifesto* that *A spectre is haunting Europe-the spectre of Communism*. Like a satanic force, one that sought to turn everything upside-down, secretive socialist cells and openly socialist intellectuals would in fact haunt Europe with their alluring propaganda and promises and their subversive totalitarian agenda. All of this was done in the name of freedom. The sum effect of the work of Marx would finally bear fruit and break out into the open like a pestilence in the 20th century. The tree that Marx planted would bear fruit first in Russia in 1917 with the Bolshevik coup and then in Germany in 1933 with the election of Adolf Hitler.

On the Jewish Question Part 1 - Prelude to Jew Hatred

Defenders of Karl Marx anti-Semitism usually either offer perfunctory and dismissive acknowledgement or they simply ignore his many published anti-Semitic sneers. As a means of turning the tables on these well-documented charges, supporters will occasionally prefer to focus on Marx support for Jewish emancipation in Europe and his rejection of Bruno Bauer's opposition to it. Putting aside the necessity for the ideologically minded to ignore reality when it does not comport to their agenda or, worse, to demonize those who speak the truth, the argument that Marx supported Jewish emancipation misses the point entirely. Marx was indisputably an anti-Semite as the record indicates. That record includes extensive acknowledgement from sympathetic Marxist sources. The evidence is much too vast for any honest denial.

Regarding Marx support for Jewish emancipation, the salient feature was his insistence that the Jews would have to reciprocate by giving up being Jewish. In the de-facto sense, Marx version of Jewish emancipation was no such thing. Marx hoped that emancipation would cause Judaism to *disintegrate*, that Judaism would be *made impossible* to use his term, as the first step toward the dismantlement of the bourgeois state. Marx theorized, like Weishaupt before him, that the sovereign state would be transformed into a one world socialist society. Thus Marx advocated that human society be emancipated from Judaism. By this means, Marx insisted, mankind would be emancipated from the various characteristics that Marx ascribed to Judaism. Adolf Hitler embraced this point of view and he acted upon it.

Marx contended that religion, a belief in a supernatural creator

who established immutable moral laws for all of mankind, was a lie that was concocted by an informal conspiracy of exploiters. Marx popularized the crackpot idea that in order for human society to progress, belief in God would have to be replaced by a faith that would worship the state as a redemptive force that would deliver humanity into an earthly utopian age. Ironically, it was Marx, not the alleged exploiters, who concocted a false idea for exploiting the masses toward his own ends. The revolutionaries sought nothing short of a new society populated by new types of human beings that had been stripped of such false ideas as belief in God and other institutions that the revolutionaries viewed as *alienating*.

Marx political theory was inspired by his contemporary Charles Darwin and his enlightenment Theory of Evolution, a biological theory that held that species, including the human "species" were evolving into superior species and thus moving toward the emergence of a new man due to a process of breeding. While Darwin did not necessarily embrace a utopian final stage of biological evolution, what the Nazis called the *ubermensch*, Marx adapted Darwin's theory into a social theory of societal evolution through stages until mankind achieved what he viewed as the highest level of social evolution. The individual, living in the final stage of Marx utopia, would have forgotten the past, would have no individual identity per se, and would have no culture or personal attachments. Ironically, Marx and his fellow revolutionaries regarded the final stage of society, what they called Communism, as a state in which mankind would achieve total freedom. This demonic piece of propaganda, the exact inverse of the truth, has indeed proven to be a cruel joke when implemented. The Marxist man, the *Homo Sovietica*, would by necessity be a lobotomized zombie.

Clearly, the revolutionaries and their allies believed that they possessed some sort of an enlightened form of wisdom that justified their absolute control over their fellow citizens, over the levers of political power, over the secular state. The revolutionaries felt perfectly justified; indeed they felt smugly self-righteous in their quest to use state power to affect their vision of societal evolution. Hitler used those same levers in his attempt to affect biological evolution and he and his concentration camp commandants felt that same sense of righteous smugness as they carried out their socialist experiment for the good of "the people." Marx called his version, which was a political as opposed to a biological evolutionary process, Dialectical Materialism.

The revolutionaries believed that gun-backed political power should be employed toward the ultimate goal of doing away with all government, all religion, and all other forms of *false consciousness* as they defined it. They sought to banish from the human mind and from the human soul anything that stood in the way of their utopia, a state in which mankind, stripped of his "superstitions," would become absolutely equal, would be

collectivized, and would then allegedly live in a state of perfect harmony with nature. Man, according to classic Marxian theory, would then no longer be alienated from himself or exploited by others. Governments would then, according to Marx, *wither away*.

The toxic ideas emanating from the revolutionaries proved to be quite

Invigorating and were literally contagious and remain so today.

The revolutionary

Idea had the effect of *Fire in the Minds of Men* which was what author and US Librarian of Congress James H. Billington meant when he utilized this phrase in the title of his book about the history of Communism from the French to the Russian Revolutions. (1.) The idea that a group of "enlightened" people could change human nature by utilizing authoritarian force is indeed a heady idea to those who crave power over others and who are in a hurry to change the world.

The means of obtaining that power is to somehow control and to ultimately remove the ability of the individual to think for himself and this requires a deliberate agenda to overthrow God in heaven. God would be replaced by the secular power of the all-knowing and all powerful state run by; you guessed it, scientifically minded Marxian elite. The context of "science" was employed by Marx and other enlightenment figures including Darwin as a means of legitimizing their theories. Once those theories were declared to be fact the practitioners, Lenin, Hitler, Stalin et al, would claim a moral mandate to control their societies and they would claim justification to implement their social experiments which were conducted, after all, in the name of "science."

Marx was not necessarily a racist anti-Semite, as that was the main form of anti-Semitism of Hitler and the Nazi crackpot race theorists. Indeed Marx, as a matter of political philosophy, did not recognize the political or social categorization of race or ethnicity as a social factor one way or another. Such race oriented political speculation would be left to the Nazis and to future Marxist theoreticians such as Franz Fanon who would develop a 20th century Marxist dialectic based upon race consciousness, a concept that has been embraced to a degree by much of the left ever since.

The revolutionaries in Marx day, including Marx himself, generally ignored race as a factor and instead focused on the political and at times the violent manipulation of class-consciousness dialectic as a means to stoke conflict between groups. They sought to ignite the violence that they believed was required to effect the authoritarian changes that they sought. Marx wrote of this in his treatise *The Victory of the Counter-Revolution in Vienna: ...there is only one means to shorten, simplify and concentrate the murderous death throes of the old society and the bloody birth pangs of the new, only one means -*

revolutionary terrorism. (2.)

Marx political or “scientific” anti-Semitism is essentially the same form that predominates today in many quarters. Political anti-Semitism formed and continues to form a core tenet of communism. Political anti-Semitism also influenced racist Nazism, which developed a hybrid that included both political and racist anti-Semitism. The anti-Christian Nazis were not above topping off their brew of hatred with a dose of old fashioned Christian anti-Semitism by resurrecting the concept of the Jew as Christ killer. The underlying principles of political anti-Semitism has endured into our own times and often applies to various categories of people other than Jews. Marx did not invent political anti-Semitism but he did more to define and to legitimize it than did any other expositor of the revolutionary faith.

The edition of *On the Jewish Question* that is quoted by this author is found on a Marxist website which states that the text was recently corrected by editors affiliated in some way with that website. This edition was chosen as the primary source in order to avoid the accusation that the text employed might have been tampered with by people hostile to Marx. (3.) This chapter consists of the text and commentary on the first part of *On the Jewish Question*, the next chapter is the text and commentary on the second part. The text of the first part of the two part treatise, the allegedly less anti-Semitic part, starts out with Marx, after rhetorically answering his own question *What kind of emancipation to they (the Jews) desire* with his answer *civic, political emancipation* criticizing Bruno Bauer’s comment, which appeared in his book *The Jewish Question*, that the Jews were *egoists* for demanding a special emancipation for themselves in Germany. Calling the Jews egoists for seeking emancipation in Germany was obviously absurd, a ludicrous charge since the Jews were the only significant minority in Germany at the time and therefore the only group that would have any reason to seek emancipation from the restrictive German laws that were exclusively directed at them.

Both Marx and Bauer, reflecting their respective young Hegelian orientation, were operating under the assumption that all Germans were oppressed and were therefore in need of emancipation as opposed to any particular emancipation for the Jews. Marx argued *why should the German be interested in the liberation of the Jew, if the Jew is not interested in the liberation of the German?* Marx and Bauer shared the view that German society required *civic, political emancipation* by which they meant the eradication of the German state to be replaced by a communist workers’ paradise. The political eradication that was advocated by Marx and Bauer was far more sweeping than a simple removal of the German government. They sought to eradicate private property, religion, family, and in general the *private ownership of the means of production* which is the standard dictionary definition of Socialism. This was what Marx

and Bauer meant when they argued in favor of emancipation.

Marx asserted: *By its very nature, the Christian state is incapable of emancipating the Jew; but adds Bauer; by his very nature the Jew cannot be emancipated. So long as the state is Christian and the Jew is Jewish, the one is as incapable of granting emancipation as the other is of receiving it.* Bauer had asserted in his book that the Jews, by their very nature, could not be emancipated but Marx, agreeing with him, expanded on the theme by asserting that neither the Jew nor the Christian would be capable of either granting or receiving emancipation. This is because Marx believed that both Jews and Christians, and for that matter any believer in God, was living in an unconscious state of slavery. Marx theorized that religion as a whole was a manufactured creation that was invented whole cloth and was a part of a greater but informal conspiracy conducted by mysterious and secretive exploiters. Certainly Marx, with his ideological blinders firmly and deliberately fastened to his brain, was ignoring the inconvenient fact, inconvenient to his ideology, that America, in his own time, was blazing the trail toward a religiously pluralistic society in which political emancipation for both Jews and Christians was a basic fact.

Marx goes on to express a type of self-hating anti-Semitic sentiment that is all too common with Jews who crave assimilation and who seek to conform socially into the non-Jewish society in which they live when he asserted: *But the Jew, too, can behave towards the state only in a Jewish way - that is, by treating it as something alien to him, by counterpoising his imaginary nationality to the real nationality, by counterpoising his illusory law to the real law, by deeming himself justified in separating himself from mankind, by abstaining on principle from taking part in the historical movement, by putting his trust in a future which has nothing in common with the future of mankind in general, and by seeing himself as a member of the Jewish people, and the Jewish people as the chosen people.*

The above sentiment is much more offensive and aggressively anti-Semitic than might be perceived at first glance. The statement reveals the revolutionary attitude of resentment toward those who might see themselves as outside of the false conception that they call the collective. Even though Marx rejected the bourgeois state, which he also viewed as a false consciousness set up by an informal conspiracy of exploiters; nevertheless he admired conformity as an intermediate stage toward collective consciousness and, as such, he disliked those who would run against the grain. Because the Jew was different in certain ways, because he maintained separate religious laws and customs than those of the Christian majority in Germany, Marx called their beliefs *illusionary*, beliefs that were opposed to the German mainstream to which he referred to as *real*.

The accusation by Marx that the Jew would treat the predominantly non-Jewish state in which he lived as *something alien to him* is an outrageous and vicious lie that could only come from a profoundly self-hating former Jew such as Marx. The idea that Jews as a minority would not consider themselves to be completely loyal and fully integral citizens of a predominantly non-Jewish nation, for example, that the French Jew would not be as French as the non-Jewish Frenchman or that the American Jew would not be as American as the non-Jewish American, is a dangerous and false anti-Semitic smear. This was the same vicious and false accusation that was leveled at French Captain Alfred Dreyfus during the famous Dreyfus Affair.

Marx did not invent this particular anti-Semitic question, the question of loyalty on the part of the Jew to the nation in which he resides, but he amplified and updated the old lie within progressive circles thus granting the old libel a new and scientific sounding twist. What is worse is that the international revolutionary edifice that Marx inspired in fact did lead many Jews astray to the degree that many of them did eventually, in their adherence to the revolutionary agenda, become disloyal and even alien to the countries in which they resided. Of course it is also true that the vast majority of those who became disloyal to their respective countries in the service of the international revolution were not Jewish, that the nature of such disloyalty on the part is a heresy and is treason against Judaism, and that the vast majority of Jews remained loyal and patriotic citizens of their nations.

Marx went one-step further than merely libeling the Jewish people by declaring that they were aliens within the nations in which they lived when he wrote that the Jew deemed himself as *justified in separating himself from mankind*. For Marx, not only was the Jew an *alien* in the non-Jewish society but he was also an alien, as a Jew, to the entire human race and to all of mankind. Of course, in context, Marx viewed any separation of peoples, and any separation of nations, as alienating to his view of the collective international beehive. His complaint that the Jews had abstained *on principle from taking part in the historical movement*, is a criticism of a lack of interest on the part of the Jews in his revolutionary movement, which he believed to represent the future of human society. This statement was also a swipe at Judaism itself, as a religion with principles of rugged individualism, principles which would make it impossible for the observant Jew to participate in his atheistic and collectivist scheme.

His comment that the Jew was *putting his trust in a future which has nothing in common with the future of mankind in general* is again a swipe at Judaism as a religion and as an ethical and moral system that has no room for his vision of the future. Marx vision was one where ethics and morals are determined by an atheist and allegedly scientific elite. That elite would set the

rules in the interest of the so-called common good as opposed to a faith that is based upon immutable and Divinely inspired truths. The passage ends with Marx darkly mentioning, without any context, that the Jew sees himself as a *member of the Jewish people, and the Jewish people as the chosen people.*

Without qualification, this mention of the Jew as part of the chosen people plays into the hands of the worst and darkest of anti-Semitic conspiracy theories. The idea of the Jews as the chosen people is not an idea in which the Jew sees himself as in any way superior to others, as Marx implies, but rather the concept of chosen-ness is based upon the idea that the Jews were chosen by God at Mt. Sinai to serve the Lord with an extra layer of obligations and a couple of extra moral strictures and restrictions. The Jews were not chosen by God to be better than non-Jews but rather to serve God with extra obligations and to therefore serve mankind as a light unto the nations. This idea, it should be pointed out, is not unique to Jews as Catholic Priests view themselves as having a special spiritual mission as do Armenian Christians and Hopi Native Americans.

The sum total of Marx attitude toward the Jews indicates that he resented their traditions because they did not conform to prevailing opinion and that he therefore viewed the chosen concept as the centerpiece of that refusal on the part of Jews to conform. This attitude should remind the reader of the previous mention in this book of the complaint of Haman, the Prime Minister of ancient Persia, regarding the Jews as described in the Book of Esther. Marx goes on, in his brilliant and hypnotic writing style and absolute sense of scientific certainty, to assert: *On what grounds, then, do you Jews want emancipation? On account of your religion? It is the mortal enemy of the state religion. As citizens? In Germany, there are no citizens. As human beings? But you are no more human beings than those to whom you appeal.* Obviously calling Judaism an enemy of the state religion of Germany or of any religion is a dangerous and a dastardly lie.

Marx answer to anti-Semitism was simple and straightforward. He called for the abolition of Judaism and of all religion, which would, he contended, end anti-Semitism. He explained: *The most rigid form of the opposition between the Jew and the Christian is the religious opposition. How is an opposition resolved? By making it impossible. How is religious opposition made impossible? By abolishing religion.* This approach by Marx, an approach that conventional wisdom and common sense would immediately indicate is impossible, actually transcends mere religion but rather goes right to the very core of the revolutionary understanding of the purpose of human life on earth.

Marx saw naturally occurring opposition and conflict in dialectical terms, which is to say that he viewed opposing and

conflicting views, and for that matter any form of competition as phenomena that was un-natural and that therefore could be made impossible. The method that Marx advocated to achieve this dubious goal was to actually accentuate those differences and to then seek to instigate a conflict. The dialectical theory held that because of the enhanced conflict, both sides would be destroyed and out of the detritus would emerge a new and more evolved paradigm. Marx theory of political evolution focused on accentuating the conflict between the economic and social classes, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The ultimate goal of the trumped up conflict would be a society in which there would be no more conflict because there would be no differences between people.

As soon as Jew and Christian recognize that their respective religions are no more than different stages in the development of the human mind, different snake skins cast off by history, and that man is the snake who sloughed them, the relation of Jew and Christian is no longer religious but is only a critical, scientific, and human relation. Science, then, constitutes their unity. But, contradictions in science are resolved by science itself.

This statement constitutes the classic credo of atheism. That theistic religion is nothing more than a figment of the imagination, a *development of the human mind*, and as such theistic religion represents a lower rung on the social evolutionary chain. This attitude toward faith based religion, that it is a primitive superstition, at least subliminally permeates so-called progressive thinking to this day. Once the snake skin, the religion, is cast off by history, a snake skin that was invented by the snake, which is man in the service of exploiting his fellow man, according to this theory, than *critical, scientific, and human relation*, according to Marx, will iron out the conflict and the supposed contradictions. Thus *science*, the revolutionary political science which is a politicized form of science that is not held up to the standards of evidence and reason would according to theory take care of everything naturally once the scales fell from the eyes of man.

In the text of *On the Jewish Question*, Marx acknowledges, along with quotes from Bauer that concur with that acknowledgement, that the United States, as a secular nation free from formal religious affiliation, was therefore religiously emancipated. Yet Marx, after sarcastically noting that America was *pre-eminently the country of religiosity, as Beaumont, Tocqueville, and the Englishman Hamilton unanimously assure us*, concludes that *since the existence of religion is the existence of defect, the source of this defect can only be sought in the nature of the state itself*. He then briefly examines the alleged *defect* that caused the American people to embrace religion with such enthusiasm. That defect, he speculated, was that America, while embodying political emancipation as a secular state, has not embraced what

he referred to as *human emancipation*. This would be a form of emancipation that would transcend both political and religious emancipation. He wrote: *We no longer regard religion as the cause, but only as the manifestation of secular narrowness.*

Marx referred to *secular limitations and restrictions* in his attempt to explain the phenomena of American freedom. He claimed that America would get rid of what he referred to as its *religious limitations* only after it got rid of these *secular limitations*. He viewed religious freedom in America, accentuated by the observation that the American people had so reverently embraced religion, as evidence of the weakness, as opposed to the strength, of American political secularism. Religious freedom was proof, for Marx that America was flawed and more so by the overall religiosity of the American people.

According to Marx *human emancipation* was a social condition in which the contradiction between religion and the secular state would disappear. For Marx, therefore, religion in America, which he referred to as a societal *defect*, could only be eradicated and America could only be made free of *superstition* if America advanced, or evolved as it were, into a condition of what he called human emancipation. This condition was, Marx contended, more advanced, or more evolved than the lesser evolved American condition, which, according to Marx, was a political condition of mere political emancipation. Of course, and obviously, human emancipation was a term utilized by Marx as a thinly veiled euphemism for communism. Thus, Marx viewed religious emancipation in America not as religious emancipation per se but rather as the *emancipation of the state from Judaism, from Christianity, from religion in general.*

Since Marx viewed religion as a superstition and as a defect in human society, and by inference a defect in the human being, he therefore presupposed that religion in America was a contradiction to genuine emancipation and secularism. His solution to this supposed contradiction, his idea of societal progress for America, was the collectivist conception of human emancipation as opposed to the American conception of individual emancipation. Marx believed that in the course of the evolutionary march toward human emancipation, religion, or what was for Marx superstition, would naturally *wither away.*

Marx expressed the crux of his attitude toward religion, an attitude that remains prevalent today amongst those who have internalized his theories when he wrote *The limits of political emancipation are evident at once from the fact that the state can free itself from a restriction without man being really free from this restriction, that the state can be a free state without man being a free man.* In other words, the existence of the American Republic served as proof for Marx that the government can be free of religion while the individual citizen remained enslaved by

it.

How an individual who had voluntarily and willingly embraced religious belief in a free and secular society would somehow be enslaved Marx does not explicitly explain. His contention that the religious belief or practice of the individual in a free society is somehow a restriction is a type of arrogance toward religion and condescension toward religious people that continues to know no bounds to this day.

Marx was a classic intellectual radical and as such, he set a pattern for his followers. One of the basic tools in his intellectual toolbox was his fierce insistence on avoiding any appearance of contradiction in his own work and in finding contradictions in that of his opposition. This is standard procedure for the left today and is often brought down to the most trivial of minutiae. This author, as a conservative radio talk show host, has debated hundreds of left-wing activists and writers over the years and their hunt for contradictions, along with their intensive search for a tiny mistake in my presentation are the *modus operandi*. Once the mistake or the contradiction is identified, the left-wing commentator will then attempt to dismissively dispatch with the opponent and try to demolish the credibility of the opponent altogether. The point of fact in contention, the discovery of a wrong date, a wrong page number, a wrong punctuation, and the left-winger then tries to call victory. A standard critique written by a left-winger often reveals that the argument is made by attacking the opponent through finding the most trivial and irrelevant of mistakes.

Yet the left-wing debater is so caught up in trivialities that he often fails to see, or more likely he refuses to see the fallacy of his overall argument. Thus, Marx was careful to avoid contradictions in his argument yet every attempt to put his philosophy into practice has proven that his ideas are contradictions of reality. Thus, Marx abstractly avoided contradiction when he wrote that all religion was a restriction on human advancement yet a simple observation proves this to be false.

Likewise with his theories of class conflict, private property, and capital. He may have gotten certain particulars right, in context, but like his followers he generally missed the forest for the trees.

The other motivation for the left in their highly legalistic approach to argument, based upon their style of discovering the tiniest and most insignificant mistake in the argument of their opposition, is that the left intrinsically understands that they have constructed a massive and completely abstract edifice based upon easy to prove falsehoods and that therefore the structure itself must be protected at all cost. Thus, ultimately, the radical faith is an ideology of power, as power is the only means that can keep a falsehood afloat. Additionally, it is ok for the left-wing interlocutor to lie in the furtherance of an ideology. This

author has spotted regular streams of deliberate and yet artfully presented lies over the years from left-wing guests and respected experts on the air in the course of their being interviewed. The left-winger must win the argument at any cost and by any means necessary.

Marx dualistic view of human nature is revealed in the following passage of *On the Jewish Question*: *The perfect political state is, by its nature, man's species-life, as opposed to his material life. All the preconditions of this egoistic life continue to exist in civil society outside the sphere of the state, but as qualities of civil society. Where the political state has attained its true development, man - not only in thought, in consciousness, but in reality, in life - leads a twofold life, a heavenly and an earthly life: life in the political community, in which he considers himself a communal being, and life in civil society, in which he acts as a private individual, regards other men as a means, degrades himself into a means, and becomes the plaything of alien powers.*

Marx idea of heaven is *life in the political community* in which man becomes a *communal being*. This is not a heaven in the religious sense but it is rather a description of a heaven on earth where human society progresses, or evolves as it were, from the stage of the civil society, which in this case is an allusion to America. In Marx utopian political community, man would no longer be a *commodity in which he degrades himself*, which is a reference to involvement in private ownership, faith, family, and any other institution that causes him to be separated or made different, or put in competition with his fellow man. Marx viewed this condition as artificial, as one in which man had become alienated from himself. As such, Marx views man as a victim or as a *plaything of alien powers*, which is an indirect reference to this mysterious exploiting class, which, allegedly, invented all of the aforementioned institutions as a means to exploit people. *The relation of the political state to civil society is just as spiritual as the relations of heaven to earth.* It was quite common for nineteenth century revolutionaries such as Marx to utilize religious metaphor when referring to their non-religious ideas. A common metaphor for revolutionaries, for example, was to speak of "miracles" when referring to revolution. Marx used the religious metaphor quite skillfully when he compared the earthly and imperfect condition of human society, the *political state* to the religious conception of imperfect man while comparing his idea of the perfected state of society, the *civil society* to the religious conception of heaven. *The political state stands in the same opposition to civil society, and it prevails over the latter in the same way as religion prevails over the narrowness of the secular world - i.e., by likewise having always to acknowledge it, to restore it, and allow itself to be dominated by it.*

The inherent problem with the religious metaphor as utilized by Marx was that Judeo-Christian religion, which is what Marx was referring to, did not call for an earthly utopia, the equivalent of

Marx civil society, but rather Christianity and Judaism recognize the imperfect nature of man and the existence of sin. While the Judeo-Christian understanding recognizes the tension between the secular societies verses the one proscribed by divine revelation, the religious idea was one in which the individual would accept the divine idea by his own volition and, once accepted, use those ideas to influence his own life and the secular society within the context of individual freedom.

The religious view did not expect earthly perfection. Marx expected his perfected heaven on earth to be implemented by the attainment of militant victory over the earthly *political state* while the religious conception was of a much smaller and non-authoritarian scale. The Judeo-Christian man might achieve individual victory over his own evil nature by understanding right from wrong, by utilizing that knowledge as a guide toward exercising personal restraint and by improving the overall lot of his fellow man.

The influence of Emmanuel Kant on Marx was evident when he wrote *in his most immediate reality, in civil society, man is a secular being. Here, where he regards himself as a real individual, and is so regarded by others, he is a fictitious phenomenon. In the state, on the other hand, where man is regarded as a species-being, he is the imaginary member of an illusory sovereignty, is deprived of his real individual life and endowed with an unreal universality.*

A pied piper of the enlightenment, Kant divided the world into two spheres in a manner similar to that of the ancient Zoroastrians of Persia and the Manichean Gnostic cult of pre-Christian Rome. Kant removed the moral content from the equation, the world of good and the world of evil, as it was understood in ancient times when he postulated that the world was divided into the amoral nominal and the phenomenal spheres. As Kant defined it, the nominal world was the everyday world that was perceived by man, a world that was not actually real according to Kant, and the phenomenal world, which was the real world according to Kant. The phenomenal world was not knowable or accessible to man. At its core, the philosophy of Kant, and later that of Marx, was based upon the thesis that the world is not actually real and that there is no such thing as objective reality.

This is an important element in understanding the revolutionary faith of Marx and his inheritors. Nothing is real and everything is perception. If reality is real than it is unknowable. This was the faith of the Gnostics of the early Christian era, the idea that truth, to the degree that there was truth, was unknowable and hidden. Marx made dark references to the hidden forces that controlled society implicating the Jews were the puppet masters. Sigmund Freud would embrace the Gnostic approach in his so-called scientific theories about the subconscious which was that the individual is essentially hidden

from himself.

By this means, everything would therefore be based on emotion, sensory perception, and imagination as opposed to identifiable fact. Once the premise was accepted that nothing was real, and that therefore anything was possible, then there would be no such thing as an objective determination of what is right and what is wrong. After all, one man's perception of what is right might vary from the perception of another and who is to judge? Morality thus becomes relative and situational in the hands of Marx and his followers. Everything would be up for grabs.

Yet Marx certainly did espouse set principles and once those principles were translated into the Kantian realm, which is to say when those principles were conveyed to a public that had accepted the idea that reality was unknowable, then public opinion and perception could be more readily molded. The first principle of Marx and that of the social revolutionaries was collectivism. This principle held that, since there was no objective truth as such, the best condition for mankind, and the only hope for progress was for man to surrender such "false consciousness" as religion, property, love, personal identity, and any institutions that might separate the human being from his fellow and to submit to collectivism, what was truly and demonstrably an entirely false consciousness. Marx contended that collectivism was the only state of being that was not contradictory and he was correct. In the collective, the man becomes a spoke in the wheel, part of the collective, which would mean as such that there would be nothing to contradict. Within the collective society man could not therefore be exploited by his fellow man. The collective was the only state in which there could be no deception or lies since there would be nothing to deceive or lie about.

In addition, this principle, the principle that nothing is real and that everything is subjective, is at the core of the authoritarian principle that Marx and his progenitors adhered to. If nothing is real then it becomes necessary for a council of enlightened experts to guide human society forward as a means of staving off anarchy and extinction. The same council of experts, with Marx generally granting them the important and legitimizing imprimatur of science, would therefore define reality in the vacuum of non-reality. If there was no reality, as the reason goes, then the experts would have to invent reality. This becomes particularly imperative, as Marx instructed, since the "exploiters" had also invented realities to suit their own agenda. In addition that agenda, according to Marx, was based on self-interest as opposed to collective interest. It is this principle, more than any other that animated and has justified totalitarian regimes from Pharaoh to Hitler. There is not, never has been, or will there ever be any such thing as a collective as Marx defined the term.

Thus, Marx intoned, *Man, as the adherent of a particular religion, finds himself in conflict with his citizenship and with other men as members of the community.* Besides the fact that this statement is patently false, that the adherent of a particular religion is not necessarily in conflict with his citizenship per se or in conflict with his neighbors, the statement reflects the collectivist view and goal. Marx was decrying the fact that any citizen, or any group of citizens might hold to different opinions or points of view than those of their neighbors. If there was one principle that could be identified as the keystone of the collectivist requirement it would be conformity.

Differences, whether those differences are based upon opinion, religion, or material property, are anathema to the collectivist ideal. Leftists are often heard intoning slogans indicating that they celebrate differences or diversity. Many unwitting liberals believe this. Nothing could actually be further from the truth. They celebrate the appearance of diversity, a superficial designation of diversity and only in a situational context as part of the dialectical process in which eventually authentic and genuine diversity between people will be eradicated or, to use nomenclature from Marx, *made impossible.*

Thus, Marx declared: *Of course, the bourgeois, like the Jew, remains only sophistically in the sphere of political life.* For Marx, the Jew and the bourgeois, or the property owner, is not worthy, indeed not capable, of raising from the *sphere of political life*, and, as such, the Jew and the bourgeois, of whom Marx makes no differentiation, is incapable of raising above what Marx contends is the less evolved political stage in human progress and into the exalted condition of civil society which is a euphemistic reference to his vision of utopian communist collectivism. Yet in this case Marx does not blame the Jews or the bourgeois specifically for their less evolved condition, he rather blames the *sophistry of the political state itself.*

Marx was observably wrong when he wrote that *Man emancipates himself politically from religion by banishing it from the sphere of public law to that of private law* and he was equally wrong when he wrote that *The state as a state annuls private property...as soon as the property qualification for the right to elect or be elected is abolished, as has occurred in many states of North America.*

Firstly, and clearly, religion is by no means banished from the public square in the secular republic, and certainly not from influencing culture or public life as a result of the secular state separating itself from a particular denomination of religion. Judeo-Christian religious moral and ethical precepts continue to hold a profound and indeed a pivotal influence on American politics and culture. This fact has often been bemoaned by those

who have been influenced by Marx and, from their perspective, their criticism is correct. The religious man is less prone to fall for the siren song of collectivism. This is also true with regards to institutions such as private property, institutions that have thrived and have expanded to all classes especially since the America removed ownership of private property as a qualification for citizenship.

While Marx goes on to accurately and lucidly elucidate on the problems inherent to a political state that includes religion as part of its formal governing structure, he also revealingly writes that *these-called Christian state is the imperfect state, and the Christian religion is regarded by it as the supplementation and sanctification of its imperfection*. This comment reveals Marx 'scientific' view toward politics and the state, a view that held that the state, and the human being, could be perfected through the application of his so-called science. He claims that Christianity supplements and sanctifies the imperfection of the state and, putting aside the inherent problems associated with religion as a part of governance, he is correct. The Christian state is indeed imperfect and Christianity does sanctify that imperfection. That is because a cornerstone of the Christian faith is an acceptance of the truth, which is that man is, in fact, imperfect, that man has a sinful nature, and that this condition is natural to the human being. Therefore, human society can only possibly reflect upon that imperfection.

In this sense, religion is in a better position to claim the mantle of science than is Marxism, which believes that man and human society can be perfected through science. Human life and human societies will never be made to be perfect as life itself is not nor can it ever be made perfect. This is a fact that should be obvious and is inherently understood even by a young child. Human beings make mistakes and make wrong decisions and these mistakes can often affect not only the person who makes them but others. The same is true in the animal kingdom. This is a simple fact of nature and it will never change. While human beings and society certainly can be improved through greater moral clarity, humanity will not and cannot ever be perfected. Marx believed in the possibility of creating a perfect state of existence and a long and infamous list of his followers literally tried to create such a state. The result was more death and suffering than mankind had ever known yet some of his followers to this day continue to applaud those evil efforts and the demented ideas that drove those efforts, by describing them as "idealistic."

Marx recognized political emancipation, religion, private ownership, and other ideas and institutions that foster universal freedom as flawed because they encouraged the development of the individual, a development he views as regressive. *None of the so-called rights of man, therefore, go beyond egoistic man, beyond man as a member of civil society - that is, an individual withdrawn into himself, into the confines of his private interests*

and private caprice, and separated from the community. Marx fundamental objection, therefore, to the rights of man, as they were articulated in his day in the French Constitution, rights based upon *private interests and private caprice*, was that these factors served to separate man from what he considered to be progressive, which, he contended, was progress toward *human emancipation*, a term he employed as a euphemism for collectivism.

He further defined what he meant by political society causing alienation, causing man to be separated from himself, when he wrote *In the rights of man, he is far from being conceived as a species-being; on the contrary, species-like itself, society, appears as a framework external to the individuals, as a restriction of their original independence. The sole bond holding them together is natural necessity, need and private interest, the preservation of their property and their egoistic selves.* Marx bemoaned concepts that fostered what he referred to as the egoistic self, the very qualities that are necessary for individual freedom. He contended that the basic work of human progress was to obliterate or to *make impossible* such basic human qualities as individual ego, private interest, religion, and property.

Marx views were typical of the authoritarianism of the radicals in his day and today. The genuine enlightenment emerged out of the Middle Ages starting with the Renaissance, which emphasized the centrality of the individual. Further progress was made by the American Revolution and Napoleon carrying forth genuine enlightenment ideas across the continent. In Marx day, genuine nationalist movements gave birth to the sovereign nations of Greece and Belgium and later to the unification of Germany and Italy. These genuinely universal developments contributed to the emergence of modern states with political stability modern economy and upward mobility.

Yet Marx found these developments to be puzzling. *It is puzzling enough that a people which is just beginning to liberate itself, to tear down all the barriers between its various sections, and to establish a political community, that such a people solemnly proclaims the rights of egoistic man separated from his fellow men and from the community, and that indeed it repeats this proclamation at a moment when only the most heroic devotion can save the nation, and is therefore imperatively called for, at a moment when the sacrifice of all the interest of civil society must be the order of the day, and egoism must be punished as a crime.*

Marx believed that the emerging condition of liberty should have presented the opportunity for societies to become more authoritarian, to move away from the political rights of man and to regress toward collectivism. This view predominates within the left today. This reminds me of a very liberal radio talk show colleague of mine, Arne Arneson, who believed that the biggest mistake made by President George W. Bush was that in the

aftermath of the terrible shock of the September 11th 2001 attack, Bush had failed to take the opportunity to raise taxes and further concentrate power in Washington in the alleged interest of making systemic and allegedly progressive changes.

This fact becomes still more puzzling when we see that the political emancipators go so far as to reduce citizenship, and the political community, to a mere means for maintaining these so-called rights of man, that, therefore, the 'citoyen' is declared to be the servant of egotistic homme, that the sphere in which man acts as a communal being is degraded to a level below the sphere in which he acts as a partial being, and that, finally, it is not man as citoyen, but man as private individual [bourgeois] who is considered to be the essential and true man. This reflects Marx Gnostic view that somehow bourgeois man is enslaved, is the *servant of egotistic homme* of unseen forces and that the way to freedom is to fuse into the collective.

Indeed the private individual is, in fact, the essential and true man. The so-called communal being is a figment of Marx imagination, an idea that was fabricated and conjured up in his own fecund and abstract mind. Most people would choose not to become a communal being, whatever it is, if given a choice. This is not because people are either stupid or duped by *false consciousness* as Marx claimed but rather because people are capable of perceiving what is in their best interest and what is the best means of moving society forward. Marx was an abstract theoretician who lived entirely in the realm of ideas that were clearly divorced from reality.

In his book *Intellectuals*, British historian Paul Johnson described Marx as a deskbound intellectual who rarely met real working people. While holding working people in contempt, Marx preferred the company of those who were like him, middle-class intellectuals who dwelt in the abstract world of factoids and statistics. (4.) Attempts by his various followers over time to take those ideas and to make them real resulted in grim and gruesome failures, as this would inevitably and ultimately be the case whenever any political system is enthroned that is based on big lies.

In the final chapters of the first part of *On the Jewish Question*, Karl Marx, in his succinct and brilliant style, makes illusion to his vision for the proper course of human society and it is clear that his vision was that of a totalitarian world. Marx thus crystallized the regressive totalitarian aspect of the enlightenment and, as such, he ignored and indeed contradicted the actual intent and the real warp and woof of the enlightenment movement itself, a genuinely progressive movement toward individual rights and human freedom. His totalitarian vision, the changing of human nature by force, and its methodology, which was perpetual war, or revolution until all of

humanity had submitted, remains at the core, although mostly internalized, of the faith of the so-called progressive movement today. In its essentials, ironically, these same principles serve as the core beliefs of today's radical Islamist movement.

Marx started the section by accurately proclaiming that *Political emancipation is, at the same time, the dissolution of the old society on which the state alienated from the people, the sovereign power, is based.* He accurately identified this society as one based on feudalism, which is, of course, a more primitive form of authoritarianism. The enlightenment, which was breaking out and in full swing all around Marx, a phenomena that he might have noticed if he had been willing to actually step outside of his study and had gone out to observe real working conditions, was eroding the absolute feudalistic powers of the ancien regime of the hereditary rulers of Europe. The genuine enlightenment movement sought to further weaken those old concentrations of power and to replace them with popular rule and limited forms of government. Europeans were progressing, in this regard, on the lines of the successful and inspiring example of America.

Marx complained that the feudal society *determined the relation of the individual to the state as a whole - i.e., his political relation, that is, his relation of separation and exclusion from the other components of society.* Indeed, working people were separated, as a matter of state policy in feudal societies, from the ruling class with little hope of advancement except in the rare case of individuals rendering services to the degree that they might be allowed to advance at the whim of the ruler. One of Marx biggest calling cards was the promise of abolishing artificial and unjust separations and creating a society where all people would be, de facto, equal. Of course, as history has demonstrated, the practical effect of Marx scheme was to replace one form of separation with one that was totalitarian and enslaving. Regarding feudalism, Marx concluded that *because of this organization, the unity of the state, and the consciousness, will, and activity of this unity, the general power of the state, are likewise bound to appear as the particular affair of a ruler and of his servants, isolated from the people.*

The fact that feudalism needed to be reformed was not controversial. The American Revolution was in reaction to an attempt by the King of England to exert a feudalistic form of power over the American colonies. Napoleon swept away many of the old feudal structures in Europe. Yet Marx went too far, and for that reason he was regressive when he exhibited not only a false account of events but also his totalitarian tendencies. He wrote that *the political revolution which overthrew this sovereign power and raised state affairs to become affairs of the people, which constituted the political state as a matter of general concern, that is, as a real state, necessarily smashed all estates, corporations, guilds, and privileges, since they were all*

manifestations of the separation of the people from the community.

The fact is that all estates, corporations, guilds, and privileges were not *smashed* by the reform of feudalism, to use a term that Marx revolutionary followers in subsequent generations would employ with ferocious frequency, nor should they have been smashed. The political and social problem with these entities in feudal Europe, and the real cause of the genuine societal separation, was not the existence of these entities per se but rather that these centers of power were either directly running the government itself or that they were protected by the government, in the monopolistic sense, to the degree that they were able to employ public power to shut out their competition. By calling for the *smashing* of these institutions, as opposed to a system that would privatize them and force them to rise and fall on their own merits under a de jure form of government equality, Marx would seek to deny the right of all people, the wealthy and the poor, the merchant and the laborer, the corporate owner and the small shop owner, to have any hope of advancement or any semblance of freedom.

The political revolution thereby abolished the political character of civil society. Marx reference to the political revolution, and the political society, was a reference to the American Republic and the emergence of liberal democracy in Europe as a system that was replacing feudalism. His reference to civil society was of a society that existed only in his mind and that was this demented fantasy of a collectivized world. Therefore, the political revolution could not have broken up something that never existed and can never exist. *It broke up civil society into its simple component parts; on the one hand, the individuals; on the other hand, the material and spiritual elements constituting the content of the life and social position of these individuals.* Quite right.

In an eloquent, accurate, and unintended paean to genuine enlightenment, Marx wrote that *It set free the political spirit, which had been, as it were, split up, partitioned, and dispersed in the various blind alleys of feudal society. It gathered the dispersed parts of the political spirit, freed it from its intermixture with civil life, and established it as the sphere of the community, the general concern of the nation, ideally independent of those particular elements of civil life.* Thomas Jefferson could not have written a better description of the Republican form of government that he so masterfully expostulated upon in the American Declaration of Independence.

But then Marx spoils the mood and breaks the spell by writing that *A person's distinct activity and distinct situation in life were reduced to a merely individual significance.* Mere individual significance indeed! What could be more significant, and what could be more universal a concept than the right of the individual

to be free? What form of government could be less alienating than the one that serves those natural interests?

Going further, Marx thundered that *they no longer constituted the general relation of the individual to the state as a whole. Public affairs as such, on the other hand, became the general affair of each individual, and the political function became the individual's general function.*

This, again, is exactly true with regard to a free society yet Marx poses this as a problem, as a phenomena standing in the way of his view of progress. Marx assertion that *Political emancipation was, at the same time, the emancipation of civil society from politics*, reflects a totalitarian view that holds that the ideal state, the *civil society*, was one in which *politics* is not a separate endeavor and, indeed, cannot be separated from the state. Thus, for Marx, the state is the only legal political entity, the state is thus solely entrusted to conduct all political affairs, and this would extend, for Marx, into all personal affairs of the citizen.

Marx critique of the so-called political state as lacking *even the semblance of a universal content*, besides the patent falseness of this assertion, also reflected the totalitarian internationalist view, the insistence that for the Marxist society to evolve into the communist utopia the movement would have to conquer the world. True universalism, as it was emerging all around Marx, involved the emancipated individual who supported a sovereign form of government that served to protect and defend those rights.

Marx ends the first section of his book *On the Jewish Question* as a true disciple of Hegel with a dialectical analysis of society. First, he identified feudalism as having undergone the dialectical conflict between the egoistic ruler and the emerging egoism of the bourgeois class. The synthesis of the conflict was first the political state and then the civil society. *This man, the member of civil society, is thus the basis, the precondition, of the political state. He is recognized as such and by this state in the rights of man.*

Yet Marx decries the emergence of the egoistic man as a regressive development as he viewed egoism is regressive. Thus, he anticipates the next dialectical conflict within the political state between the bourgeois class and the proletariat. *The liberty of egoistic man and the recognition of this liberty, however, is rather the recognition of the unrestrained movement of the spiritual and material elements, which form the content of his life.* This statement reflects Marx contempt for private ownership, of the private individual experiencing control over the *spiritual and material elements* of his private life. He thus objects to a man experiencing freedom within the context of a limited republican form of government.

Hence, man was not freed from religion, he received religious

freedom. He was not freed from property; he received freedom to own property. He was not freed from the egoism of business; he received freedom to engage in business.

The perverse and utterly false logic expressed here was that personal faith, private property, and the free trade of goods and services were ideas and institutions that were somehow alienating and enslaving. Marx no doubt passionately believed that his ideas would somehow change the human condition for the better but a simple observation of fact indicates that he was just plain wrong. Faith, property, business, these concepts represent the foundational building blocks of human freedom. These ideas and concepts have been refined over millennia of human experience and trial and error. These institutions liberate men when they are exercised in the context of free will. The form of government that best reflects the most natural and suitable for human progress protects the right of the individual to create and to improve his own life. Freedom cannot exist without faith, property and the right of the individual to offer his goods or services on the free market. Marx turned reality on its head when he claimed that the building blocks of freedom enslaved mankind.

The establishment of the political state and the dissolution of civil society into independent individuals - whose relation with one another on law, just as the relations of men in the system of estates and guilds depended on privilege - is accomplished by one and the same act. Man as a member of civil society, unpolitical man, inevitably appears, however, as the natural man.

By the *natural man*, Marx means the man existing in a communist society who would therefore have become a cog in the wheel of the collectivized society. Marx definition of the natural man has proven to be the biggest and most devastating lie in history, the lie from which all other modern political and social lies have emanated.

Marx viewed the *rights of man*, which were increasingly exemplified in his own time as the freedom emanating out of the genuinely progressive enlightenment, as rights that were rather a form of false consciousness. Marx defined that false consciousness, the *egoistic man*, as having emerged from the synthesis of the dialectical struggle that advanced society away from feudalism. He was right to identify the egoistic man as the *passive result of the dissolved society, a result that is simply found in existence, an object of immediate certainty, therefore a natural object*. Of course, Marx did not view such characteristics that did, indeed, emerge out of feudalism and the dark ages as developments that were positive and progressive.

The political revolution resolves civil life into its component parts, without revolutionizing these components themselves or subjecting them to criticism. This reference to political revolution, as opposed to what Marx and the revolutionaries

sought which was total and continuous social revolution, violent revolution that would transform human nature, was that the political revolution was incomplete because it continued to support the separation of forms. The incompleteness meant that the political revolution would not result in absolute de-facto equality. Marx sought to revolutionize the components that had emerged from the political developments of the enlightenment and subject them to criticism. It is clear from his writings that the criticism to which he referred were that the egoistic man, the enlightened man, had embraced the instruments of freedom.

Regarding the newly emerging political society, Marx observed that it regarded *the world of needs, labor, private interests, civil law, as the basis of its existence, as a precondition not requiring further substantiation and therefore as its natural basis*. While he was correct to not that the freedom oriented societies that were emerging did indeed regard the world of needs, labor, private interests, and civil law as the natural basis of existence, he was wrong to claim that such a society would not require further substantiation in the true sense. Man freed from oppressive government and therefore in control of his own destiny to a high degree is always looking for substantiation. The genuine work of living, and of science, is one in which new truths are discovered and invented based on what has already been determined. Marx believed that such substantiation would expose the falsehood of the newly acquired freedom.

Finishing his critique of the egoistic man, Marx wrote that *finally, man as a member of civil society is held to be man in his sensuous, individual, immediate existence, whereas political man is only abstract, artificial man, man as an allegorical, juridical person*.

This sentiment holds more than a shade of the philosophy of Emmanuel Kant. Thus, the newly emerged political man living in the freedom oriented civil society cannot know himself. His alienation is because of a dialectical war waging not only within his new society but also within his own being. On the one hand, man is experiencing sensory perception, individual identity, and a sense of existence in the here and now. On the other hand, man is an abstract artificial entity, an allegorical juridical person. The two opposite parts, forming the new Hegelian dialectic, are reminiscent of the nominal and phenomenal world, the knowable but false world and the unknowable but true world that was conjured up by the mad social scientist Emmanuel Kant. Thus, for Marx, *The real man is recognized only in the shape of the egoistic individual, the true man is recognized only in the shape of the abstract citizen*.

And what does Marx present to the world as the solution, which he describes at the end of part one of *On the Jewish Question*, to the dilemma that he contrived out of whole cloth? He answers his own question by calling up one of the most influential figures of

the enlightenment, the inventor of the modern collectivist fantasy, Jean Jacques Rousseau the renegade and debauched author of *The Social Contract*. Thus, Marx credited Rousseau for accurately describing the abstract idea of political man by republishing the following quote:

"Whoever dares undertake to establish a people's institutions must feel himself capable of changing, as it were, human nature, of transforming each individual, who by himself is a complete and solitary whole, into a part of a larger whole, from which, in a sense, the individual receives his life and his being, of substituting a limited and mental existence for the physical and independent existence. He has to take from man his own powers, and give him in exchange alien powers which he cannot employ without the help of other men."

Regardless of whether Rousseau was thinking about the limited form of government that would empower man, and yet would require the individual to turn over a modicum of his rights and privileges to the state in the interest of the maintenance of a cohesive and orderly society or whether Rousseau meant the total surrender of rights that would define collectivism, Marx interpreted Rousseau to mean the latter. Man is a social being by nature. Individuals look to each other to help them get through life and to improve their own life. Individuals thus naturally form associations with other like-minded people for reasons of friendship, professional advancement, business, as in corporations, educational improvement, and a host of other reasons. These associations do, indeed, transform society sometimes for the better and sometimes for the worse.

Either way, social interaction is most effective when left to the individual to choose the nature of those interactions without state coercion. Marx, and probably Rousseau as well, did not trust man to make his own decisions on social interaction to the degree that man would have to surrender this basic human right to the collective.

This Marx concluded part one with the complaint that *all emancipation is a reduction of the human world and relationships to man himself. Political emancipation is the reduction of man, on the one hand, to a member of civil society, to an egoistic, independent individual, and, on the other hand, to a citizen, a juridical person.*

He expressed his vision for the new synthesis that would, he claimed, emerge from the previous synthesis that resulted from the collapse of feudalism. He stated that *Only when the real, individual man re-absorbs in himself the abstract citizen, and as an individual human being has become a species-being in his everyday life, in his particular work, and in his particular situation, only when man has recognized and organized his "own powers" as social powers, and, consequently, no longer separates*

social power from himself in the shape of political power, only then will human emancipation have been accomplished.

Thus Marx called for a mystical, a metaphysical, and even perhaps a biological metamorphosis of the human being, the human species, into a new and allegedly superior, indeed a perfected state of existence. And it is this grandiose idea that the individual man, indeed mankind can be changed into something better than he presently is that appealed to the idealist then and today.

On the Jewish Question Part 2 – Jew Hatred

Karl Marx and the radical social revolutionaries of his day based much of their social theory on the identification of categories that separated human beings from each other. And what were those separations to which Marx referred? Religion, nationality, property, money, and even family and individual identity itself. Marx believed that these so-called separations, these various entities that made people in some way separate from each other, were the cause of what he referred to as alienation. Marx believed that this alienation was brought about by an informal conspiracy of exploiters who manufactured these separations for nefarious purposes. These exploiters, according to theory, created false consciousness in order to deceive people and to thus use them to gain material profit. Marx believed that humanity would only become truly free, or emancipated, if those separations, which he also blamed for what he contended were problems associated with inequalities between people, were done away with, or as he was prone to write, *made impossible*.

In a personal sense, Marx described the individual as existing in a condition of separation from what he called his species-self, his true nature. The solution to the dilemma, according to Marx, was to abolish the social condition of separation, or inequality, a condition that he contended was responsible for *contradictions*. The theory of contradiction, or the identification of allegedly opposite and irreconcilable components, provided the so-called *science* in Marx theory. The answer to the problem, for Marx, was collectivism. Only through collectivism, a social condition in which humankind would no longer be controlled by these external and contradictory factors could man truly be himself. Marx contended further that the development of republican forms of limited government, liberal democracy, served to further accentuate the manufactured condition of separation and inequality. The theory held that collectivized man would no longer be burdened with the alienating effects of human beings being different from each other, separated, or unequal.

The downside, which Marx did not speculate on, was that in order to advance within Marx paradigm of progress all of humanity would have to become lobotomized. Where anti-

Semitism entered into the picture was the fact that Marx originally ascribed all of the factors that he viewed as separating man from each other, these causes of alienation, these vehicles of conspiracy by exploiters, these obstacles to human progress and happiness, as being the sole preserve of the Jewish people. He furthermore believed, as bizarre as this may seem, that by eliminating Judaism altogether, these categories of separation would disappear from human society.

He believed that these attributes, which he viewed as profoundly negative and regressive, existed in non-Jewish Christian society because of the Jewish influence. In fact, his entire theory of capitalism, of trade, of economy, of property, of money, is based upon the idea that these attributes were exclusively Jewish traits that had influenced the world. Later on, when this sort of vicious anti-Semitism became somewhat problematic for the Marxist movement, the Jewish aspect of the theory would become subterranean but it would never entirely disappear. The progressives would replace the word Jew in their lexicon with the word capitalist but the meaning would remain the same.

Part II of *On the Jewish Question* starts out with Marx criticizing his colleague Bruno Bauer, the author of *The Jewish Question*, with the following quote from Bauer regarding the alleged problems associated with emancipation for Christians as opposed to emancipation for Jews. *The Christian has to surmount only one stage, namely, that of his religion, in order to give up religion altogether and therefore become free. The Jew, on the other hand, has to break not only with his Jewish nature, but also with the development towards perfecting his religion, a development which has remained alien to him.* The assumption expressed here by Bauer was typical of radical revolutionaries in his day as well as today which was the demonstrably false notion that religion per se was essentially an informal form of slavery and that religion would have to be given up in order for mankind to be free.

The reference by Bauer to Judaism as being inherently unperfected, as opposed to Christianity, which Bauer viewed as a perfected religion from a theological standpoint, was a common anti-Semitic Christian understanding of Judaism at the time. Bauer was trained as a Christian theologian before he moved to the left and as such, he had imbibed many of the traditional anti-Semitic Christian misunderstandings of the nature of Judaism. Thus, he viewed Christianity, from a theological perspective, as perfected or completed since Jesus, the founder of the church was recognized as the Messiah who offered a means for his followers to be absolved of sin. Bauer thus believed that Christianity would be more amicable as a theology to communism which was a political faith based on the concept of perfection and completion except without God or the divine aspect.

If Christianity offered completion, or absolution, through the

divine intermediary of the advent of the Son of God, communism would offer the complete and absolute utopia on earth through what was considered science. Thus, the Christian only had to pass through one hoop, so to speak, and that was the abandonment of the divine in order to achieve emancipation as the term was employed by Bauer and by Marx and that was the earthly social collective condition that they referred to as communism. Judaism, on the other hand and according to Bauer, was theologically speaking incomplete since Judaism did not recognize the Messiah and as such, the Jew had rejected the concept of completion and absolution and was therefore more resistant to the tender ministrations of collectivism.

Responding to Bauer, Marx wrote that *Thus, Bauer here transforms the question of Jewish emancipation into a purely religious question. The theological problem as to whether the Jew or the Christian has the better prospect of salvation is repeated here in the enlightened form: which of them is more capable of emancipation. No longer is the question asked: Is it Judaism or Christianity that makes a man free? On the contrary, the question is now: Which makes man freer, the negation of Judaism or the negation of Christianity?* And it is here that Marx begins to turn the question of Jewish emancipation into a political as opposed to a strictly religious question.

Marx, agreeing with Bauer, quotes from his book *The Jewish Question: The Jew contributes nothing to humankind if he himself disregards his narrow law, if he invalidates his entire Judaism.*

Karl Marx, thus politicizing the issue while retaining the religious analysis of Bauer, proceeds to define exactly what he had in mind when, agreeing with his colleague Bruno Bauer, he described the alleged qualities of the Jewish contribution to mankind. Marx, quickly moving in on the punch line of his thesis continued:

We are trying to break with the theological formulation of the question. For us, the question of the Jew's capacity for emancipation becomes the question: What particular social element has to be overcome in order to abolish Judaism? For the present-day Jew's capacity for emancipation is the relation of Judaism to the emancipation of the modern world. This relation necessarily results from the special position of Judaism in the contemporary enslaved world.

After setting the stage for announcing his definition of the so-called *social element* that he contended was the foundation stone and essence of Judaism, he goes on to distance himself from Bauer's old fashioned and un-scientific analysis of Judaism without rejecting it out of hand when he famously wrote: *Let us consider the actual, worldly Jew - not the Sabbath Jew, as Bauer*

does, but the everyday Jew. Marx proceeds on a pernicious and damning examination of the *worldly Jew* an examination that has echoed through time ever since. The vicious smear that Marx codified regarding Judaism was by no means invented by him but, rather, Marx gave an old and dangerous libel against the Jews a new and scientific sounding veneer. Marx contributed a great deal toward making anti-Semitism respectable in polite elite modern company and in that sense; it could be argued that he was one of the main inventors of what could be called scientific anti-Semitism. Instead of the old Christian concept of the Jews as Christ killers, Marx promoted a new-fangled anti-Semitism focused on the alleged qualities of character that he claimed were corrupting human society.

Thus, Marx arrived at his blunt and central accusation and at the grand and damnable libel of his thesis:

Let us not look for the secret of the Jew in his religion, but let us look for the secret of his religion in the real Jew.

What is the secular basis of Judaism? Practical need, self-interest. What is the worldly religion of the Jew? Huckstering. What is his worldly God? Money. Very well then! Emancipation from huckstering and money, consequently from practical, real Judaism, would be the self-emancipation of our time.

And there you have it. Marx booklet was published exactly a century before the gas chambers and the crematoria of Hitler's Nazi Germany would be doing just that, engaging in the emancipation of Europe from the Jew and, allegedly, from the influence of huckstering, self-interest, practical need, money, and all of the other qualities that Marx ascribed to the Jews. Radical National Socialist Nazi Germany added scientific racism to the inhumane mix, a scientific racism that they derived from the other great European so-called progressive figure, the *scientist*, and Marx contemporary Charles Darwin. Nazi Germany was clearly as much an inheritor of the traditions and philosophy of Marx and of the radical revolutionaries as was Soviet Russia. Both radical socialist movements, the spawn of the dark side of the enlightenment, sought to eliminate human qualities that they insisted stood in the way of their transformative vision of humanity and, in both cases, the result were proverbial mountains of dead and rotting innocent human corpses.

Getting back to *On the Jewish Question: An organization of society which would abolish the preconditions for huckstering, and therefore the possibility of huckstering, would make the Jew impossible.* This was a clear call by Marx for Auschwitz. Marx must have understood that the only thing that could be made impossible would be to eliminate what he called huckstering, which would therefore logically mean that those who refused to

give up their huckstering, in his case the Jews, would themselves have to be *made impossible*. It should be understood that the idea of eradicating from human experience such human attributes as huckstering, self-interest, and practical need is insane.

There would be no other way than a program of annihilation as any person or any group that stood in the way of Marx socialist utopia would, by logic, have to be annihilated. Marx and his followers, whether they be Hitler or Stalin, Mao tse Tung, Pol Pot et al, had convinced themselves that they were creating by their actions a better human society, and a more evolved human race, which is why they were so self-righteous and so insufferably congratulatory toward each other as they marched those who they viewed as standing in the way of their progress off to the death camps, or the Gulag, or the Laogai. They believed that they were acting scientifically and in a humane manner when they conducted their Holocausts, Genocides, forced starvations, Great Leap Forwards, Cultural Revolutions, and collectivization. A famous example of this attitude was expressed by one of the Nazi masterminds of the Holocaust against the Jews, Adolf Eichmann, when he testified at his trial in an Israeli court that he felt that the death camps were humane.

Perhaps Marx was hoping to avoid the impending Holocaust, a Holocaust that he must have had an inkling would sweep away some of his own relatives and associates, and a Holocaust that he must have at least at some level sensed that he had set up when we wrote: *His religious consciousness would be dissipated like a thin haze in the real, vital air of society*. Either Marx was completely demented or he was simply one of these ivory tower crackpot intellectuals who had become completely divorced from reality. The idea that the qualities that Marx ascribed to Jews would simply and voluntarily dissipate like a thin haze in the vital air of communism is simply delusional.

The idea that anyone would willingly give up self-interest, practical need, huckstering, which was a euphemism for freely trading goods and services, or money, is just crazy. And for what? The values expressed here, the presentation of what is good and right, is a complete inversion of the truth yet this idea has been largely internalized by the left to this day. No one, not today and not ever, voluntarily gives up freedom or liberty and the atmosphere of collectivism or slavery is anything but vital.

Yet, in a style that is in a way reminiscent of the Broadway show *Fiddler on the Roof*, Marx opined that *On the other hand, if the Jew recognizes that this practical nature of his is futile and works to abolish it, he extricates himself from his previous development and works for human emancipation as such and turns against the supreme practical expression of human self-estrangement*.

This appears to have been a plea from Marx to the Jews to give

up their alleged Jewish traits, their so-called previous development, and to join him and become a part of the new and progressive sunny future of collectivism and communism. Of course, too many Jews fell for this canard and indeed joined the legions of the mostly non-Jewish so-called progressive revolutionaries. It is interesting to note, however, that not one of those Jews who gave up their Judaism in the name of progressive communism, Marx himself included, gave up their own self-interest, huckstering, money, or any of the other traits that Marx insisted would dissipate into thin ether.

Allow me to digress briefly. I once asked a so-called progressive relative of mine, after he explained to me that he admired the Marxist slogan *from each according to his ability to each according to his need* why, if he was such an admirer of Marxism, he did not live by its credo.

There was nothing stopping him, I pointed out, from distributing his own accumulated wealth to others in need. He could choose to live only on what he needed to live and he could give the rest of his *surplus capital*, to coin a Marxist axiom, to others who had not accumulated enough capital to do the same. He could, furthermore, in America, get together with other like-minded collectivists, pool his property and assets with theirs, and live in a commune. That way, I delicately mentioned, he would no longer have to feel guilty or be a hypocrite. After all, I pointed out, he was enjoying a more than comfortable retirement with property, a pension, stocks, bonds, and other features of *surplus capital*. Pressing the point, I brought up the fact that he was able to accumulate these assets as an American living in and protected by the American capitalist system.

His response was revealing. He contended that he had spent his entire life working hard as a public school teacher and, in that capacity; he had always advocated liberal and so-called progressive values to young people. Because of this, he contended that he deserved to enjoy the fruits of his labor. On the other hand, he contended, the CEO of a corporation did not deserve to enjoy his assets because his corporation, and for that matter all corporations, had, after all, engaged in the exploitation of workers. The CEO did more social good in a day than my relative could ever do in ten lifetimes by creating jobs, by marketing products, and by developing opportunities. Corporations, especially American corporations, are responsible for more social advancement than any structure known in human history.

But getting back to the text of *On the Jewish Question: We recognize in Judaism, therefore, a general anti-social element of the present time, an element which through historical development -to which in this harmful respect the Jews have zealously contributed - has been brought to its present high*

level, at which it must necessarily begin to disintegrate.

Did Marx have any idea how damaging this comment would be to the Jewish people? That the Jews possessed these so-called *anti-social elements*? Marx needed to manufacture some sort of dialectical conflict between forces, and he needed to convince those forces that they existed as separate entities and that they were in conflict with each other in order to work out his abstract condition of synthesis, or progress. It was, however, inexcusable for him to have used the Jews as the scapegoats in his social experiment. In this light, Marx had the audacity to deliver a coup de grace against the Jews when he wrote that *In the final analysis, the emancipation of the Jews is the emancipation of humankind from Judaism.*

With regard to audacity, and after having the nerve to call for the *emancipation of humankind from Judaism*, as if that were not bad enough, Marx then proceeds to approvingly quote Bruno Bauer espousing the Jewish international banking conspiracy theory. Bauer wrote the following in *The Jewish Question*: *"The Jew, who in Vienna, for example, is only tolerated, determines the fate of the whole Empire by his financial power. The Jew, who may have no rights in the smallest German state, decides the fate of Europe. While corporations and guilds refuse to admit Jews, or have not yet adopted a favorable attitude towards them, the audacity of industry mocks at the obstinacy of the material institutions."*

Marx endorses this conspiracy theory, the idea that Jewish bankers, operating secretly as Jews, control Europe through the issuing of credit to European leaders. Marx responds to Bauer as follows: *This is no isolated fact. The Jew has emancipated himself in a Jewish manner, not only because he has acquired financial power, but also because, through him and also apart from him, money has become a world power and the practical Jewish spirit has become the practical spirit of the Christian nations. The Jews have emancipated themselves insofar as the Christians have become Jews.* The level of this anti-Semitic tirade knows no bounds.

To suggest that Marx booklet, published in 1844 did not influence the conspiracy theory against the Jews that is contained within the pages of the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, first published in 1909, or *Mein Kampf*, first published in 1925, would be an example of naïveté to put it mildly. Marx published his most influential booklet *The Communist Manifesto*, in 1849 and this made Marx an internationally renowned and revered figure on the forefront of the revolutionary left. The reverence held for Marx, and the reach his influence has remains in place today. The suggestion that the widely disseminated book *On the Jewish Question* did not directly influence the anti-Semitic conspiracy theories contained in the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* or *Mein Kampf* is preposterous.

Marx blamed the Jews for introducing to humankind qualities that he contended were bad but in fact were the building blocks of freedom. Self-interest, making a profit, supporting oneself, creating business opportunities, faith, these were and remain positive human attributes. Certainly corruption and dishonesty occurs, as this represents the darker side of human nature, but when it does, as it inevitably will, this has more to do with the character of a specific individual, or more specifically with the lack of character of the same and nothing really to do with money, trade, self-interest etc. per se. These attributes, which Marx despised, were and remain inanimate concepts that are imbued with degrees of good or evil depending upon the practitioner involved. It has been this utterly asinine and completely infantile notion that these attributes are inherently bad and that they should be therefore drummed out of human society and the human being that had actually been the root cause of most of the significant evil in the world these last several centuries.

Yet Marx takes this seemingly insatiable hatred for the Jews a step further. Besides blaming the Jews for what are inherently human attributes, he goes on to blame the Jews for introducing these natural characteristics into Christianity. Thus, according to Marx, the Jews were responsible for corrupting the entire Christian world by introducing Christians to these inherently human values.

Quoting from Thomas Hamilton, the author of *Men and Manner in America*, Marx proceeds to blame the Jews for what he sees as the evil attributes of the American Republic. He wrote: *Indeed, in North America, the practical domination of Judaism over the Christian world has achieved as its unambiguous and normal expression that the preaching of the Gospel itself and the Christian ministry have become articles of trade, and the bankrupt trader deals in the Gospel just as the Gospel preacher who has become rich goes in for business deals.*

Get it? When the Christian in America is corrupt that is because of the Jewish influence over him. This is besides the premise that the Jews are to blame when Christians engage in legitimate trade, property, self-interest, and *huckstering*.

Marx then presents what he contends is a dialectical conflict within Judaism by first quoting from Bauer who wrote of *a fictitious state of affairs when in theory the Jew is deprived of political rights, whereas in practice he has immense power and exerts his political influence en gros, although it is curtailed en détail.*

Marx then responds to Bauer's alleged contradiction by driving home his own contention, of which he concurs entirely, a step further: *The contradiction that exists between the practical political power of the Jew and his political rights is the*

contradiction between politics and the power of money in general. Although theoretically the former is superior to the latter, in fact politics has become the serf of financial power.

Marx thus raises an issue that has remained standard conspiracy theory to this day both on the left and to a degree on the right and that is the effects of the influence of private capital, or what Marx calls financial power, over public politics. Unfortunately, and quite libelously and falsely, Marx accused the Jews of holding the reigns of this financial power and not just because they were Jews, which would have been bad enough, but also because, he contended, financial power is in of itself an inherently Jewish creation and character trait.

It is true that private capital, whether accumulated under the umbrella of corporations or banks, particularly state banks and merchant banks, holds a considerable degree of sway over politics. It would be absurd to deny this. The common accusation made by the conspiracy theorists, however, is that centers of financial power collude secretly with each other to control politics and society. This author rejects this theory while at the same time recognizing the powerful influence of finance, which has been and remains both a positive and a negative influence on politics and society. Whether Jews happen to be involved at any time in the corporations or banks in question is completely irrelevant unless, of course, one accepts the sinister and completely unfounded Jewish conspiracy theory that Marx endorsed and elaborated upon.

Elaborating further on the theme, Marx wrote that *Judaism has held its own alongside Christianity, not only as religious criticism of Christianity, not only as the embodiment of doubt in the religious derivation of Christianity, but equally because the practical Jewish spirit, Judaism, has maintained itself and even attained its highest development in Christian society. The Jew, who exists as a distinct member of civil society is only a particular manifestation of the Judaism of civil society.*

Marx re-enforced old and shop-worn notions of Christian anti-Semitism while adding a new and scientific sounding wrinkle. Thus it could be argued that Marx was the father of what could be referred to as father of scientific anti-Semitism. Adding insult to the already devastating injury Marx then declared, in a bumper sticker like sloganeering style: *Judaism continues to exist not in spite of history, but owing to history. The Jew is perpetually created by civil society from its own entrails. What, in itself, was the basis of the Jewish religion? Practical need, egoism.*

However, Marx did not stop there. He proceeded to deny and to strip away the most basic and fundamental element of Judaism as a faith which is a belief in one God. *The monotheism of the Jew,*

therefore, is in reality the polytheism of the many needs, a polytheism which makes even the lavatory an object of divine law.

This is a vicious and ugly assault on Jewish observance and dignity and it is a complete lie as Marx must have known. Marx was descended from eminent Rabbis and Jewish scholars on both his mothers and his father's side. Surely he must have been aware of the centrality of the belief in one God to Jewish life. Jewish practice does indeed tend to be ritualistic, and this is truer for the more observant Jew, but Jewish ritualism is meant to serve as a reminder to the Jew of the one God, the creator of the universe. Jewish ritual has nothing whatsoever to do with polytheism. When a Jew chants a prayer after washing his hands he is directing that prayer to the one God, not to the bathroom sink! The central prayer in Jewish life is:

Hear o Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is One.

Marx then accurately and ironically states that *Practical need, egoism, is the principle of civil society, and as such appears in pure form as soon as civil society has fully given birth to the political state.* Indeed, practical need, which is natural and necessary to the human condition and which propels every human being to get out of bed every morning, and *egoism*, which is individual identity, the understanding of the uniqueness of every single human being and the inherent worth and value of every single individual human life, does thrive in what Marx called the political state.

By this Marx meant the liberal democracy although, as an aside, a basic understanding of human nature indicates that nothing exists in its pure form when it comes to human beings. Indeed, the idea of humanity existing in any definition of a pure state, or a perfect world, is an expression and an idiom of a utopian view that was more akin to those who would share Marx political outlook and orientation than those who understand the impure and imperfect nature of human freedom.

The god of practical need and self-interest is money. This is absurd. Money is a means of exchange, storage of value, and an abstract means of measuring time. Practical need, self-interest, which is the desire to help oneself, one's family, friends, relatives, colleagues, community, country, is natural and does lead to ambition and creativity. These phenomena are expressed in all manners depending on the individual involved. The artist expresses self-interest through creating art; the truck driver expresses self-interest by driving a truck from point A to point B etc. Certainly many people are too self-interested to the point where they might engage in deception or criminality in order to satiate their outsized sense of self interest but self-interest, per se, and certainly practical need are positive forces in society.

Money, the abstract means in which individuals and groups are able to conduct transactions between parties, to share and to trade, has no moral content per se. The moral value is only imbued by the giver and receiver of money and this is reflected in the nature of the transaction. As storage of value, money offers the individual the opportunity to accumulate the fruits of his labor over time and to then dispense of those fruits at a time and in a setting chosen by him. Thus the bearer of money has attained a level of freedom that he created from his own efforts. Money is thus an abstract expression of private property, which Marx sought to abolish and replace with "collectivist" control of property.

Money is the jealous god of Israel, in face of which no other god may exist. This is, of course, a Goddamn lie and may Marx be cursed to eternal hell for having put this into print. All individuals and peoples, historically and today, need money in order to conduct free transactions. Money buys groceries to a person can eat. The farmer who grows the produce in the grocery store needs money so he can put gasoline in his tractor to harvest the groceries. Barter certainly does occur without money but in those cases the bartered goods become a form of money. The idea that a Jew would be more concerned about money than a non-Jew is absurd. Marx himself lived off loans he never paid back to people he associated with and inheritances. The God of Israel is the God of Israel. Obviously this idea that the Jews worship money has been the cause of anti-Semitism especially when people are for whatever reason facing hard times. Marx greatly contributed to that anti-Semitism.

Money degrades all the gods of man - and turns them into commodities. The system that actually did turn human beings into commodities, soulless cogs in the wheel, human resources, was the communist system advocated by Karl Marx. Once a man surrenders his money, his property, his right to trade in goods and services, he becomes a dispensable and defenseless commodity of the state.

Money is the universal self-established value of all things. It has, therefore, robbed the whole world - both the world of men and nature - of its specific value. Money does, indeed, establish the value of things in the free market and the specific value of things when a voluntary transaction takes place. If money, serving as an abstract means of exchange, does not serve this purpose than what would serve to determine the specific value of things? Primitive people at the dawn of civilization devised a means of counting money whether it was hash marks on the wall of a cave or seashells. Every society, historically and today, utilizes some form of money. There is simply no other means to arrive at the value of things.

Money is the estranged essence of man's work and man's existence, and this alien essence dominates him, and he worships

it. This is an insult to all of humanity. Of course, the working person expects to receive money as a form of compensation for work performed. This offers the working person a level of freedom of action as opposed to estrangement. The condition of estrangement would be the result of work without money and this would be slavery. Marx must have been aware of the existence of chattel slavery in the United States at the time he wrote his book. He must have realized that work without pay was one of the basic instruments, along with terror and powerful centralized states that was required to maintain the plutocracy in the American southern states. The lack of pay was a basic factor in keeping people enslaved in the antebellum American south. Marx followers would resurrect slavery in the 20th century with the development of communist systems in which the government did, indeed, control the money and the entire population existed in a condition of virtual slavery.

The god of the Jews has become secularized and has become the god of the world. This is a re-iteration of Marx bizarre contention that somehow Money was a particularly Jewish invention and represented the essence of Jewish character. That the very existence of the Jewish people has led to a corrupting of the entire world as evidenced by the fact that all of the peoples of the world were using money and were, incidentally, beginning to develop the institutions of freedom, private ownership of property, free trade and the like, in Marx time and that he sought to stop that from happening.

The bill of exchange is the real god of the Jew. His god is only an illusory bill of exchange. This is a re-iteration of Marx contention that money, property, free trade, were forms of *false consciousness*, that were invented by the exploiter, in this case the Jews, as a means of exploiting others for their own *self-interest*. In the deeper sense, the idea that money, which Marx calls the *real god of the Jew*, is an *illusory bill of exchange*, and is therefore not real, is an essential expression of the view that nothing in the universe is actually real but, rather, everything is an illusion. This view is that there is no such thing as reality itself.

The view of nature attained under the domination of private property and money is a real contempt for, and practical debasement of, nature; in the Jewish religion, nature exists, it is true, but it exists only in imagination. In other words, Marx contends that money and private property are unnatural institutions, created by Jews and that therefore the Jewish religion itself is not real but is also a form of *false consciousness*. This goes beyond a sheer statement of atheism, which would be the belief in this case that there was no god as god is understood by Judaism.

This is also a repudiation of both the religious and secular

attributes of Judaism and this is particularly pernicious given the fact that those secular attributes, which Marx repudiates, are universal and as such transcend any particular religion. He then calls down a poetic quote from 16th century radical Protestant theologian Thomas Munzer, who led an uprising that was viewed by the revolutionaries

as an early communist experiment, with the following very charming and alluring chestnut: *that all creatures have been turned into property, the fishes in the water, the birds in the air, the plants on the earth; the creatures, too, must become free.*

Contempt for theory, art, history, and for man as an end in himself, which is contained in an abstract form in the Jewish religion, is the real, conscious standpoint, the virtue of the man of money. This is a damnable lie; nothing could be further from the truth. There is a discernible trend that runs like a thread through Marx writing and through much of the logic and philosophy of many of those who have been influenced by his ideas and that is a tendency to ascribe to their enemies, that which in fact would more accurately describe themselves. Not to necessarily draw any direct parallels here but it should be noted that this practice is at the core of Satanism.

The Satanist will turn everything on its head. What is good becomes bad and what is bad becomes good in their topsy-turvy world. Right becomes wrong and wrong becomes right. The truth is that the collectivist vision of Marx would rob the individual of theory, of art, and of history as the individual would become submerged into the beehive. Marx collectivism is the ultimate expression of contempt for the idea of man as an end in himself as man would have surrendered the most basic essentials of private ownership, the ownership of his own life, in favor of the collective.

Judaism, Christianity, and the trend of western civilization culminating in the establishment of the American Republic and the positive trends of the European enlightenment, the true struggle of Europeans to become free from feudalism, represent the flowering of theory, art, and history. The development of private ownership, of individual rights, and of an abstract means of trade and storage of value, money, has been the engines of man living as an end in himself.

The species-relation itself, the relation between man and woman, etc., becomes an object of trade! The woman is bought and sold. This, again, is a dastardly inversion of the truth. Trade, in a free society, is a voluntary activity arrived at privately. Trade, as such, benefits all parties involved. In a trade, each party gives up something to obtain something in return. As far as women being bought and sold in a free society, this would be impossible as slavery and coercion, in a free society would be banned. In a free country, buying and selling women is a crime. In a communist

country, women, men, and children are literally the property of the state, which, according to socialist notions, would be conducting that *public ownership* collectively in the interest of the people.

The chimerical nationality of the Jew is the nationality of the merchant, of the man of money in general. Dare I suggest that the nationality of all freedom-loving peoples is the nationality of the private merchant, trading his goods and services for equal value on the free market. Might I also add that the hallmark of that means of exchange, the abstract medium that makes that exchange possible, is honest currency which permits the citizen to thrive and prosper knowing that money will retain its quality as a strong means of asset accumulation and savings and as an accurate reflection of the private production of the nation.

The groundless law of the Jew is only a religious caricature of groundless morality and right in general, of the purely formal rites with which the world of self-interest surrounds itself. This is probably the ugliest and most dangerous piece of anti-Semitism contained in Marx book. This is an attempt to discredit the Jewish codes of morality and ethics that emanated from Sinai and from the Torah. Those same laws were passed on to Christianity and they continue to form the underpinning of the western democracies including that of the United States. There is no moral code known to man that could be described as more grounded than that of the Judeo-Christian moral code. Once again, Marx is inverting the truth. Marxism, at its core, is the essence of groundless morality.

Marxist morality, or revolutionary morality, is based upon the principle that whatever is determined to be in the best interest of the revolution is moral and that which is viewed as against the revolution is immoral. This is the principle that was expounded upon by 15th century Italian philosopher Niccolo Machiavelli in his book *The Prince* when he wrote of the ends justifying the means. Marxist morality thus frees its adherents from all objective moral standards and, as such, the Marxist is free to criticize a single act of immorality which occasionally occurs in a nation that they might deem as an enemy of the revolution at a given time, say the United States, while they are free to completely ignore or to excuse the monstrous immorality of, say, Communist China, when their so-called progressive revolutionary government murdered an estimated thirty millions of their own people during their progressive Cultural Revolution.

Here, too, man's supreme relation is the legal one, his relation to laws that are valid for him not because they are laws of his own will and nature, but because they are the dominant laws and because departure from them is avenged. This actually gets into an interesting question when placed in the context of a freedom-oriented society. At what point are laws legal as opposed to lawful? At what point are laws artificial as opposed to natural?

The paradox is answered, although imperfectly, by representative government. The reason the American government has been as successful as it has been which is to say the reason the American government has not slipped too far down the path of authoritarianism, is its organized system of representative government. The US Constitution, and the constitutions of the fifty states, vests the responsibility to legislate, or to construct laws, with the elected legislatures.

The US House of Representatives, and the respective state legislatures, are vested with the responsibility to weigh and measure the various and divergent interests of the population when they construct law. Since the representatives, both state and federal, must stand for election every two years and since they at least theoretically represent small districts, that representative is more accountable to the people he represents. In America, and in Parliaments and legislative bodies around the world to varying degrees, the lawmaker engages in the art and the science of weighing and measuring the interests of the opposites. In America, this translates into striking a balance between libertarianism, the right of the individual to the maximum level of freedom of choice and action, and Judeo-Christian notions of ethics and morality. All laws that are legislature passes, theoretically, are subject to a check from the chief executive, who has the right to the veto, and the independent judiciary, which, theoretically, squares the law with the US Constitution.

This imperfect system has proven to be the best means for society to avoid dominating and oppressive laws. Attorney General Harry Dougherty, who served in the Calvin Coolidge Administration, once put it right when he observed that the best way to get rid of a bad law for to enforce it. Thus the republican form of government provides the best means for laws to reflect the *own will and nature* of man. History demonstrates the obvious, which is that it has been the Marxist inspired communist systems, both literally and philosophically, that has required the domination of its citizens by the state and has exacted cruel revenge against those who have refused to comply.

Jewish Jesuitism, the same practical Jesuitism which Bauer discovers in the Talmud, is the relation of the world of self-interest to the laws governing that world, the chief art of which consists in the cunning circumvention of these laws.

Jesuitism is defined by the Nutall Encyclopedia of General Knowledge as *an attempt to achieve holy ends by unholy means* and the use of this term to describe Judaism is again an example of an inversion of the truth. Compounding this anti-Semitic slur, Marx introduces the Talmud into the mix by slanderous the voluminous work of commentary on the Torah, a body of work that is considered holy by Jews. To top it off, Marx finishes the sentence by referring to *the cunning circumvention*

of these laws, by which he means the laws governing the world. The reference to the Jews as *cunning* and as circumventing the laws is a particularly ugly piece of anti-Semitism. The idea that the Talmud is presented as evidence of this *cunning circumvention*, and in the service of *the world of self-interest* is the type of damn lie that has contributed to a particularly virulent and enduring strand of anti-Semitic thought.

The Talmud had been attacked by generations of Christians who believed this same piece of slander. Talmud burnings were not an uncommon occurrence during the Middle Ages in Europe. Marx re-enforced this false conception and helped to pull it into modern times by offering it a scientific sounding gloss of certainty.

The Talmud was largely written in the first several centuries of the Common Era and it contains a cross section of opinions, pro and con, on any number of social issues that were confronting the Jewish people who, at that point in history, had lost control of their homeland and had been driven to the far corners of exile and diaspora. There certainly were some bad passages in the Talmud, several of which were edited out in the Middle Ages. The practical purpose of the Talmud was to help the Jews carry on in the diaspora as, after the Temple and Jerusalem were destroyed and the Jews were largely driven out of Judaea. The authors of the Talmud sought to build a "hedge" around the Torah by adding certain rituals that would separate the Jews from the non-Jewish world in an attempt to insure long term Jewish survival.

There is nothing in the Talmud that intentionally contradicts the laws of the Torah as, in a practical sense; one of the functions of the Talmud was to help the Jews incorporate Torah principles into their everyday lives. No attempt to circumvent the law. Perhaps it was this aspect of the Talmud, the rituals that separated the Jews from the non-Jewish world that so enraged Marx who sought to "scientifically" abolish all separations between all people. Marx viewed such separations as a form of alienation that resulted, he contended, from false consciousness. His idea of the natural human condition was the collective.

Indeed, the movement of this world within its framework of laws is bound to be a continual suspension of law. This dastardly and anti-Semitic smear is such an obvious lie that it should bring into question anything that Marx ever wrote in the minds of reasonable and rational people. The Jewish people and Judaism per se have always advocated loyalty to the laws of the nations that have hosted them. While there have certainly been examples in history of disloyal and treacherous Jews, and non-Jews, in various situations, there is no evidence whatsoever that the Jews have ever been disloyal. It should be added that this has often been the case in situations in which the host government has prosecuted its Jewish population. By raising

this issue, Marx raised the old and sinister anti-Semitic charge of dual loyalties on the part of the Jews. Once again, Marx dragged an old libel against the Jews into modern times with his significantly influential imprimatur.

Judaism could not develop further as a religion, could not develop further theoretically, because the world outlook of practical need is essentially limited and is completed in a few strokes. This preposterous falsehood is absurd on its face. The human impulse of practical need is of course not in any way limited or completed in any way whatsoever, whether or not the additional absurdity that practical need is a Jewish characteristic enters into the picture. Practical need is the basic element that leads to genuine personal as well as societal progress. Such a ridiculous remark is almost not worthy of a response except for the fact that so many people have embraced and internalized the concept. The addition by Marx of the Jewish accusation that he attaches to this absurdity certainly turns what should be dismissed as some sort of a bad joke into a matter that is hardly a cause for humor or mirth.

By its very nature, the religion of practical need could find its consummation not in theory, but only in practice, precisely because its truth is practice. Judaism is, indeed, a religion of both faith and works. The work of Judaism certainly includes taking care of the practical needs and the self-interest of the Jew and these are good basic characteristics that the Jews hold in common with all peoples. Yet there is a lot more to Judaism than simply these basic attributes. The Jew is commanded by the God of Sinai to do good deeds, to engage in charity, to *Love thy neighbor as thyself*, and to assume an extra burden of observance, or what Marx calls practice, to serve as a light unto the nations. Judaism sees itself as a priestly caste that is to observe an extra layer of morality and ethics and is to serve God with extra ritual responsibilities. By attempting to live by the commandments found in the Torah, and developed in the Talmud, the Jew hopes to set an example for all the nations of the world.

Perhaps the nature of Jewish practice set Marx into such a rage because he sought to replace that practice with that of his own vision and that of the radical revolutionaries. Marx and the revolutionaries saw themselves as the light unto the nations, as the enlightened ones, who were going to set the example for how to live the moral life. Marx sought to replace the Godliness of the Jews, and their Christian brothers, with the worldliness of his definition of humanism. This reverence for their mission goes a way toward explaining how the revolutionary movements influenced by Marx and other revolutionaries of his day, the Nazis and the Communists, believed so reverently that they were creating more humane and moral societies by their actions and policies.

Judaism could not create a new world; it could only draw the new creations and conditions of the world into the sphere of its activity, because practical need, the rationale of which is self-interest, is passive and does not expand at will, but finds itself enlarged as a result of the continuous development of social conditions.

Judaism does not seek to create a new world, only to serve as a humble example to the people of the world who are free to embrace the universal moral and ethical codes of Sinai voluntarily. Marx and the revolutionaries, and to varying degrees all of the world conquerors of history, have sought to create a new world, or a one world government, by the force of arms and by the annihilation of resistance to what they have understood to be human progress. History has demonstrated that the conditions of freedom have transformed the world into one of increased prosperity, productivity, creativity, invention, health, and happiness.

Judaism reaches its highest point with the perfection of civil society, but it is only in the Christian world that civil society attains perfection. Only under the dominance of Christianity, which makes all national, natural, moral, and theoretical conditions extrinsic to man, could civil society separate itself completely from the life of the state, sever all the species-ties of man, put egoism and selfish need in the place of these species-ties, and dissolve the human world into a world of atomistic individuals who are inimically opposed to one another. This comment is based on the false premise that the free society has somehow separated the individual from the affairs of the political state and the political society. Marx views this situation as unnatural, he views

Christianity as having been co-opted by Judaism as evidenced, Marx contended, by the Christian embrace of practical need and self-interest, and he views the individual living in the free society as alienated from his true nature. *Christianity sprang from Judaism. It has merged again in Judaism.* This is, of course, a grand lie but one does perceive when reading this statement how much influence this idea has held over the minds and the souls of all of us. This notion is not unique to Marx. This idea appeals to the dark side of human nature, which is the infantile idea that somehow scientific knowledge will lead all of us into a world of peace and love and an end of suffering.

From the outset, the Christian was the theorizing Jew, the Jew is, therefore, the practical Christian, and the practical Christian has become a Jew again. Christianity had only in semblance overcome real Judaism. It was too noble-minded, too spiritualistic to eliminate the crudity of practical need in any other way than by elevation to the skies.

Christianity is the sublime thought of Judaism, Judaism is the common practical application of Christianity, but this application

could only become general after Christianity as a developed religion had completed theoretically the estrangement of man from himself and from nature. Only then could Judaism achieve universal dominance and make alienated man and alienated nature into alienable, vendible objects subjected to the slavery of egoistic need and to trading.

Thus Marx, after claiming that Christianity had become submerged into Judaism, and after ironically making this claim in an era in which the Christian nations and the United States were making major progress in the direction of genuine conditions of liberty and prosperity, had become *subjected to the slavery of egoistic need and to trading*. This view on the part of Marx presents a stark and clear example of why his movement, and that of the radical revolutionaries, represented a regression backward in the direction of the old and ancient oriental and totalitarian empires of the Egyptian Pharaoh and of Nebuchadnezzar as written about in the Bible. Marx followers to this day continue to insist that the big government, moving steadily toward a new world order that will remake society into a total and totalitarian world system, is progressive. Back then and today they genuinely and sincerely believe that what they stand for, public ownership of the means of production, of business, of property, of healthcare, or all aspects of the lives of the citizen, is a progressive vision and I don't for a minute either doubt their sincerity or question their determination.

Selling is the practical aspect of alienation. Just as man, as long as he is in the grip of religion, is able to objectify his essential nature only by turning it into something alien, something fantastic, sounder the domination of egoistic need he can be active practically, and produce objects in practice, only by putting his products, and his activity, under the domination of an alien being, and bestowing the significance of an alien entity - money - on them.

Marx nears the end of his paean of hate and self-hatred with a reiteration of his insistence that the free individual, who believes in a divine creator, and who is engaging in the normal and natural activities of trading goods and services, both material and abstract, with his fellow man on a voluntary and mutually beneficial basis is somehow alienated from himself and is therefore not really his true self.

That somehow egoistic need has led to his domination by others without recognizing the absurd contradiction contained in this idea. That somehow only by accepting the yoke of collectivism, the surrender of practical need, of self-interest, of religion, of property, of money, can man no longer be alienated from himself and could become one with his fellow man and with his true nature. That the Jew was responsible for introducing into the world the entire aforementioned human attributes and that the

only way to make those attributes *impossible* would be to eliminate Judaism.

Since in civil society the real nature of the Jew has been universally realized and secularized, civil society could not convince the Jew of the unreality of his religious nature, which is indeed only the ideal aspect of practical need. Consequently, not only in the Pentateuch and the Talmud, but in present-day society we find the nature of the modern Jew, and not as an abstract nature but as one that is in the highest degree empirical, not merely as a narrowness of the Jew, but as the Jewish narrowness of society.

Once society has succeeded in abolishing the empirical essence of Judaism - huckstering and its preconditions - the Jew will have become impossible, because his consciousness no longer has an object, because the subjective basis of Judaism, practical need, has been humanized, and because the conflict between man's individual-sensuous existence and his species-existence has been abolished.

The social emancipation of the Jew is the emancipation of society from Judaism.

Step right up! Right this way! Off to the gas chamber!

On the Jewish Question and the Bolshevik's

In 1917, the Russian Revolution was co-opted by the Bolshevik conspiracy in the same way that the 1793 Jacobin conspiracy co-opted the French Revolution and launched the Reign of Terror. With assistance from the government of the German Kaiser, who sought an immediate armistice with Russia along the German eastern front during World War I, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin and his communist comrades boarded a sealed train leaving Switzerland and exile making their way across Germany, a train that British Minister of War Winston Churchill referred to as *like a plague bacillus*. The train arrived at the Finland Station in Petrograd Russia.

Standing on a platform Lenin declared *We will now proceed to construct the proletarian socialist society*. His revolutionary partner Leon Trotsky had simultaneously departed from New York harbor with a satchel full of cash that had been raised for him, perhaps unwittingly, by Kuhn Loeb financier Jacob Schiff. (1.) Lenin and Trotsky proceeded to lead a government that murdered upwards of 4 million people within a short five years, people who died for *crimes against the revolution*.

The Bolsheviks overturned the unstable and moderate socialist government of Alexander Kerensky which had, in turn, replaced the abdicating Czar Nicholas II of the Romanov Dynasty. French Revolutionary Robespierre had famously stated that *the attribute of popular government in revolution is at one and the same time*

virtue and terror, virtue without which terror is fatal, terror without which virtue is impotent. The terror is nothing but justice, prompt, severe, inflexible; it is thus an emanation of virtue.

Lenin, well versed in revolutionary history and following in Robespierre's footsteps proceeded to pull the rug out from under the Russian people and their desire to achieve liberal democracy and Lenin, unlike his guillotined French predecessor, was stunningly successful in imposing upon all of the vast Russian empire the most totalitarian and repressive regime ever known in the history of human civilization. Lenin had learned many lessons from studying the mistakes of the Jacobins as thus it would be Lenin who would truly invent the practice of revolutionary justice, a form of justice that turned western notions of equal justice under the law on its head.

One myth that continues to dominate the history of the Bolshevik coup was that the Russia of Czar Nicholas II was overly repressive. Nicholas reign witnessed the further development of a Russian merchant and middle class and an emerging industrial base. While by no means moving fast enough, Russia under Nicholas was nevertheless moving in the direction of democracy.

Democratic reforms were interrupted when Nicholas stupidly embroiled his country into the senseless Great War in 1914. The ensuing expense and the chaos and carnage of that war, as well as the careful intrigues of the communist revolutionaries to exploit the chaos set the stage for the greatest hat trick in modern history which was pulled off by Lenin. Using the same false propaganda against Nicholas and the so-called Russian bourgeois as Robespierre used against Louis and Marie Antoinette, Lenin seemed to effortlessly step onto the stage of history. Hitler experienced the same sensation several decades later when he stated that he felt like a sleepwalker as his army effortlessly walked over several sovereign nations without firing a shot.

Once in power, Lenin sent a delegation to sign the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk which ended hostilities between Russia and the German Empire. Thus Russia and Germany formed a covert alliance that lasted from the 1918 signing of Brest-Litovsk until June of 1941 when Hitler double-crossed his open ally, Stalin with a full-scale Nazi invasion of Russia known as Operation Barbarossa. Mass murder, terror, planned starvations, concentration camps, the gulag system, depravations, poverty, disease, destruction, suffering, and an unprecedented loss of human freedom followed in the wake of the establishment by Lenin of the new and allegedly progressive Russian workers' paradise. Hitler and the Nazis stood watching in awe as the rest of the world, at least the part of the world that mattered, tossed Lenin bouquets.

Lenin launched the first mass terror movement of the 20th century, a fact that was certainly not at all lost either on Hitler or on the oppressed people of Europe even as the adoring left leaning intellectuals and media, operating from the safe comfort within the western democracies, fudged the details and sang the hosannas. Like preceding revolutionary movements going back to the Illuminati of Adam Weishaupt, the Russian communists believed that anything and everything was permissible in the cause of advancing their ideological vision of human progress. Lenin, proceeding in both the letter and the spirit of his mentor Karl Marx, abolished all separation of powers, and proceeded to gather all power into the hands of himself and a small and close cadre of loyal assistants. All private institutions, trade unions, elections, courts, religion, all private property was either outright abolished or was purged and turned into subservient organs of the state.

A key instrument of Lenin's state terror was the *All-Russia Extraordinary Commission to Combat Counter-revolution and Sabotage* known as the Cheka, a secretive national police force that was charged with spying on all Russians and liquidating all opponents of the revolution. Hitler was well aware of the effectiveness of the Cheka. He emulated Lenin right down to the letter when he set up the Nazi Gestapo which was charged with spying on all Germans and with protecting the German revolution.

Lenin understood the Cheka to be the most essential element and the most basic engine of his totalitarian power. The Cheka, under the hatchet faced Polish revolutionary Felix Dzerzhinsky, reported directly to Lenin. In January, 1918, Lenin ordered the Cheka the task of *shooting on the spot one out of every ten found guilty of idling*. One week later, Lenin called on the Cheka publicly: *Until we apply the terror...shooting on the spot...to speculators, we shall achieve nothing*. He then, and in a manner that conjured the spirit of Marx *On the Jewish Question*, called for the *arrest and the shooting of takers of bribes, swindlers, etc...* On February 22, 1918, he authorized the Cheka to *seek out, arrest, and shoot immediately* a series of categories of *enemies*. (2.) The Cheka would be given the job of deciding who lived and who died based on their opinion of the person. If a person was determined to be a guilty member of any one of these arbitrary categories he would most likely be murdered.

Lenin's orders to an official government agency, in this case the Soviet Cheka, to shoot entire categories of people, orders that the Soviet agency carried out quite literally and even joyously, was at the surface of an even more significant and heinous development than the simple introduction of the mass terror and murder that accompanied a government going out and shooting and murdering its own people. Lenin's orders completely subverted the rule of law, the right of the individual to be accused of a crime in an orderly manner, to face his accuser, and to undergo due process. Lenin abandoned the understanding of

individual guilt in favor of collective guilt and this was orthodox Marxism as expressed by Marx in *On the Jewish Question*. To Marx, the Jews were guilty of *self-interest* and *huckstering* and these were qualities that justified mankind emancipating itself from Judaism. Hitler did the exact same thing to the Jews twenty years later as Lenin had done to his various collective categories when he launched Kristalnacht in 1938, the night of the collective punishment of the Jews. This is, in fact, and without exception, the result of any collectivist experiment by a government as this is the very nature of collectivism.

The Bolshevik's were the spiritual and literal vanguard of a world socialist revolution. By virtue of having conquered the first socialist beachhead, the Bolshevik cadre led the march toward the utopian one world beehive. Leftists and naive liberals around the world, including many of the world's richest and most influential figures, rallied around the Bolshevik campfire as they averted their eyes from the atrocities or, like the Bolshevik's themselves, they confidently viewed the murder of tens of millions as justified. Communist ideology called for terror, indeed it required terror as a means and as a method of transforming society and shaking up the existing order.

By this means, by the blood flowing from the birth pangs of the new political species of man, and by the blood red color in the communist flag, the dictatorship of the proletariat goose-stepped on its messianic mission to sweep away the old *false conscience*. The new social order required the complete annihilation of any person or group that stood in the way yet many supporters, while luxuriating in the lap of capitalism, made strange gasping noises of approval. They focused their glassy eyes toward the new future of mankind, a future that they thought hovered just over the horizon. The Nazis and their followers used the same identical language and seemed to be implanted with the same proverbial evil computer chip at the bases of their skulls. As the nomenclature of the times exclaimed, you had to crack a few eggs to make an omelet.

An excellent source of information on the Bolshevik and subsequent communist atrocities is to be found in a book entitled *The Black Book of Communism* which was written by a respected group of French scholars and was translated into English by the Harvard University Press in 1997. This well documented and seminal book describes the Bolshevik terror as follows: *The Bolsheviks had decided to eliminate, by legal and physical means, any challenge or resistance, even if passive, to their absolute power. This strategy applied not only to groups with opposing political views, but also to such social groups as the nobility, the middle class, the intelligentsia, and the clergy, as well as professional groups such as military officers and the police. Sometimes the Bolsheviks subjected these people to genocide. The policy of "de-Cossackization" begun in 1920 corresponds largely to our definition of genocide: a population group firmly established in a particular territory, the Cossacks as*

such were exterminated, the men shot, the women, children and the elderly deported, and the villages razed or handed over to new, non-Cossack occupants. Lenin compared the Cossacks to the Vendée during the French Revolution and gladly subjected them to program of what Gracchus Babeuf, the "inventor" of modern Communism, characterized in 1795 as "populicide."(3.)

An example of the atrocities covered in *The Black Book of Communism*, one example out of many documented by the book regards Bolshevik actions in the Crimea: *Similar acts of violence occurred in most of the cities of the Crimea occupied by the Bolsheviks, including Sevastopol, Yalta, Alushta, and Simferopol. Similar atrocities are recorded from April and May 1918 in the big Cossack cities then in revolt. The extremely precise file of the Denikin commission record "corpses with hands cut off, broken bones, heads ripped off, broken jaws, and genital removed."*

The Russian historian and socialist S.P. Melgunov, in his book The Red Terror in Russia, says that Sevastopol was turned into a "city of the hanged" because of the extermination campaign against surviving witnesses: From Nakhimovskiy, all one could see was the hanging bodies of officers, soldiers, and civilians arrested in the streets. The town was dead, and the only people left alive were hiding in lofts or basements. All the walls, shop fronts, and telegraph poles were covered with posters calling for "Death to the traitors. "They were hanging people for fun. (4.)

The post Bolshevik, post Nazi culture of today is one in which most people seem to have become somewhat numbed by reports of wholesale genocide. This is an era in which most people have become almost impervious to atrocity. This is perhaps due to an awareness over the level and the scale of state sponsored violence carried out first by the Soviet Union, then by Nazi Germany, and then by Communist China and by every other communist state to this day. The Bolshevik atrocities were the precursor to all of the others that followed. Human life had become a pawn in a new collective as the communists, who were driven by the abstract phantom of human progress as they defined it, did not view each life as a separate and sacred entity in and of itself and with its own unique worth. This is why they glorified in the ongoing Holocaust that started during the French Revolution and that continues to this day.

Post World War I Fascism, Nazism and to a certain extent even the New Deal of American President Franklin D. Roosevelt were reactions to the Bolshevik terror and to a certain degree those reactions were normal and legitimate attempts by nations to protect themselves from communism and should be viewed in the context of their times. Several nations felt the need to protect themselves from the criminal nightmare that Russia had become as well as from Russian communist aggression and imperialism in the same way that an individual might protect himself and his family from a crime wave in his neighborhood by installing alarms and getting a firearm.

In order to counter the radical left-wing totalitarianism of Russia, and the fact that Russia was at the vanguard of a bloody international conspiracy of subversion, nations in the immediate vicinity of Russia who felt particularly threatened implemented more authoritarian systems as a means of self-defense. Thus Germany, Italy, and other nations shifted to the left when they installed fascist governments. Conventional wisdom in the post war era holds that those nations shifted to the right, and indeed they were to the right of Soviet Communism but they were left of the liberal democracies that proceeded them and they were very much left of America with its limited government.

In spite of the zeal that was employed by the international left and their fellow travelers and camp followers in their attempt to cover-up Lenin's dark deeds, most Europeans know what was going on. Yet the Soviet cover-up continued and the level of atrocity and butchery accelerated during the bloody regime of Lenin's successor and right hand man Josef Stalin. Collectivization continued with forced starvations, purges, and show trials. After the First World War Europeans were devastated over the loss of millions of her sons while communist conspirators plotted violent takeovers in many European capitals. Communist coups were carried out and were briefly successful in Hungary, under the butcher Bela Kun and his thugs, and in the German state of Bavaria while a coup was attempted in Berlin. In the post World War I years, in a defeated and humiliated Germany, communists posed as rivals to their ideological cousins the Nazis as both employed the tactics of thuggery, lawlessness and terrorism. Germans were susceptible to the false promises made by the Nazis, promises to restore order, to preserve basic institutions and, ironically, to protect Germany from the well-known genocide taking place inside their nearby communist neighbor to the east.

Why did anti-Semitism gain such a foothold in Germany and in other parts of Europe during those years, an anti-Semitism that became as pervasive and fierce as to lead to a Holocaust in which six million innocent European Jews were annihilated? This complex and difficult question plays into an understandably sensitive issue regarding the reaction on the part of Europeans to Bolshevism.

This is a subject that must be handled with extraordinary care and caution given the fact that such an examination has been used historically, and is still used in some quarters to justify anti-Semitism. This unpleasant and difficult subject involves an examination of the role that certain prominent Jews played in the Bolshevik atrocities in Russia, the involvement of a number of Jews in the communist experiment generally, and how that involvement was used by Hitler and the Nazis to stoke the flames of already long existing and infamous European anti-Semitism, flames that would come to consume six million innocent lives.

I'd like to remind the reader that at the beginning of this book I wrote that I would make no apologies and I would not equivocate in my quest to understand the effects of the anti-Semitism of Karl Marx and his fellow revolutionaries on the course of history and that my examination would include the influence of Marx on Hitler and on Nazi anti-Semitism. I've written on the effects that collectivism had as a state policy on mass murder and this trend obviously had everything to do with a socialistic government like that of Nazi Germany acting against a collective category of their choice such as, in the case of the Nazis, the Jews. Only a socialistic government, such as that of the Soviet Union or such as Nazi Germany would have the ability, due to their totalitarianism and to their need for a continuous policy of atrocity, to conduct a public policy program such as the Holocaust against the Jews. Anti-Semitism had always been on the European scene but it took the socialist movement to enable a government to commit a program of mass murder against the Jews to the unprecedented degree in which it occurred in Nazi Germany.

Clearly Hitler was inspired by the anti-Semitic writings of Marx in *On the Jewish Question*. Yet Hitler expressed the same strange and twisted form of anti-Semitism that has taken hold ever since his time which is one in which the Jews are blamed for both capitalism and communism and often at the same time and by the same people. Marx exemplified the idea of blaming the Jews for capitalism, which he contended was a bad thing, and with the advent of Bolshevism the Jews also became associated with communism, which really was a bad thing. In the case of communism there were a high number of prominent Jews who were involved in that diabolical movement.

Germans were concerned with the growing threat of communism emanating from the east while at the same time they were willing to believe Jewish conspiracy theories involving capitalists who they came to believe caused the defeat of the German Empire in World War I. It is the contention of this author that the collectivist conspiracy theory that sealed the fate of the Jews of Europe, and racism requires as much of a collective mindset as does Marx collective theories regarding the bourgeois, was that the European people came to believe that the Jews, collectively, were to blame for the communist terror. It is with that principle in mind that I will tread, very carefully, into an area that has been, and for very good reason, a generally forbidden topic of discourse.

The issue at hand is speculation over the impression that was made on the average Europeans who were reacting to the unprecedented evil of Bolshevism. That impression was embraced by both those who were living through the communist terror in Russia as well as those who observed the terror at close quarters in Eastern Europe and in Europe in general. That impression was one that included the observation that a significant number of high profile Jews were involved in or were

supportive of the communist terror. As a Jew myself, I am loath to write about this. I have seriously considered omitting this topic from this book but, in the final analysis, I decided to proceed into these turbulent waters for as to do otherwise would not render as true an understanding of the nature of the anti-Semitism of the revolutionary faith of Marx or of the political consequences of the implementation of that faith in Russia. One of those consequences, at least in part, was the rise of anti-Semitism in Europe which culminated in the Nazi Holocaust.

Communism was not at all a Jewish idea nor was communism a Jewish movement in any sense whatsoever. The vast majorities of Jews were not, are not, and never will be communists but the fact remains that a select number of Jews, Jews at least in name and reputation, did embrace communism and, indeed, rose to highly visible levels of power and importance within the international communist movement including in Bolshevik Russia. This cannot be denied. In the real sense, of course, this fact means absolutely nothing. The communist orientation and the actions of certain people acting on behalf of communism, who happened to have had a very tenuous connection to Judaism, is only a reflection of the beliefs and the actions of those individuals and not of the Jewish people and certainly not a reflection of the Jewish faith.

The atrocities of the communists were the fault of the atheistic communists in the same way that the atrocities of the Nazis were the fault of the Nazis.

The fact is that Judaism as a faith could not be more opposite to the political faith of communism as a belief system. The Jews who got involved in communism had either rejected their Jewish faith totally or they may have continued to make certain empty pretensions toward having a cultural connection to Judaism. Any Jewish connection to communism should be viewed more no different than claims of a Catholic connection to communism through a left-wing Catholic movement known as liberation theology or a Protestant connection to communism through the pro-communist sentiments of certain Protestant ministers that have historically been associated with the communist oriented National Council of Churches. Many Jews were as fooled by the sales pitch of communism as were non-Jews. It should also be noted that most of the Bolshevik hierarchy were not Jewish and that the Soviet Union became increasingly anti-Semitic especially after Stalin took over.

It is not exactly known why so many Jews were attracted to communism or why so many of the more prominent early 20th century communists were of Jewish background. Perhaps a simple explanation would be that many Jews simply fell for the lie that communism would eliminate anti-Semitism by eliminating all religion and therefore all religious prejudice. Many Jews, to this day, continue to cling to the lie that there is something good, something somehow benevolent about communism in spite of the

record but the same could be said of others to whom Lenin accurately referred to as useful idiots. Whatever the reason, it is a fact that that Jews held prominent positions in Bolshevik Russia, that these Jews were responsible for carrying out some of the most notorious atrocities, and that Jews held prominent positions in communist and pro-communist organizations in many other countries around the world including the United States.

Preceding a bit further, and with very grave trepidation, into this controversial subject it is useful to record some of the prominent Jewish communists who were involved in Bolshevism by name. Their names and religious backgrounds are, of course, not disputed and are an accessible part of the public record. In fact they have been proudly listed as Jews in various left wing and Jewish publications over the years. The reason that I bring this up, with more than some fear and trembling over the possibility that this information might be and historically has been used and misconstrued by anti-Semites, is because their positions of prominence in such a dastardly affair as the communist takeover of Russia in 1917 did, in fact, contribute greatly to the atmosphere in Europe that led to the Holocaust. I absolutely do not mean to suggest, or to even remotely imply that these Jews were directly responsible for the Holocaust. Let's be clear. The responsibility for the Holocaust against the Jews of Europe rests completely and solely on the shoulders of one man and that man was Adolf Hitler and on one government and that government was Nazi Germany.

Many of the Bolshevik ringleaders and many of the key players in the Bolshevik Soviet government in its early years were people of Jewish background and that included Leon Trotsky, who headed the Red Army, Grigori Zinoviev who headed the Communist International or the Comintern, the agency responsible for spreading revolution to foreign capitals, and Yakov Sverdlov, who was the Executive Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party and chairman of the Central Executive Committee, which made Sverdlov technically the first head of the Russian Soviet government. Other important Jews in the Soviet government included Karl Radek, Soviet press secretary and leader of propaganda and agitation, Maxim Litvinov, Foreign Secretary and Lev Kamenev, a head of state and Chairman of the Politburo in the early 1920's. Central Committee member Moisei Uritsky was considered to be a left-communist because of his opposition to the Brest-Litovsk Treaty and Grigory Sokolnikov was Soviet Commissioner of Finance. Trotsky, Sokolnikov, Zinoviev, and Kamenev were all key players in the political committee that plotted the Bolshevik coup in October 1917 and all were identified in the minds of the public as Jews.

Other high-profile Jewish Russian communists included Jewish Attorney Dmitri Bogrov, who was hanged for assassinating Russian Minister of the Interior Peter Stolypin while he entered the Kiev Opera House on September 1, 1911. This type of

terrorism did not make Jews popular in the minds of the Russian people. Adolf Joffe, son of a Jewish merchant, became Chairman of the Bolshevik Revolutionary Committee in 1917 and was a member of the Russian Delegation at the Brest-Litovsk conference with Germany that ended Russian involvement in World War I. Joffe replaced Leon Trotsky as Commissar for Foreign Affairs when Trotsky took over command of the Red Army. While in Berlin negotiating at the end of the war, The German authorities expelled Joffe after accusing him of participating in an abortive communist coup attempt.

Unfortunately many of the worst of the Soviet communists were of Jewish background and they were as bad as the worst Nazis years before the Nazis came to power. Lavrenti Beria founded the Russian secret police, a precursor to the Nazi Gestapo. Beria has been linked to the infamous Katyn massacre and other atrocities. Lazar Kaganovich, who personally claimed responsibility for the murder of twenty million people, stood on top of the rubble of a Christian church proclaiming *Mother Russia has been cast down, we have torn away her skirts!* Genrikh Yagoda sent hundreds of thousands of people deemed not politically correct to work on the Baltic Sea canal project, a forced labor situation analogous to slavery where countless numbers of Russians, Ukrainians, and Baltic people perished. Nataly Frenkel and Mathias Berman founded the infamous Gulag system with camps commanded by figures such as Rappoport, Solz, and Spiegelglas, all of whom are mentioned at length by writer Alexander Solzhenitsyn. (6.) Ilya Ehrenburg, the World War II communist counterpart to Josef Goebbels, incited Soviet troops to rape and maim German, Polish, and Czech women as a form of punishment.

Dear reader, dear fellow Jew. You are probably aware of the many viciously anti-Semitic books, articles, websites, and blog sites that have delved into the issue of the many Bolshevik communists with Jewish backgrounds and that these sources have drawn ugly and anti-Semitic conspiracy theories from this information. Indeed, historically, those who wove those libelous conspiracy theories derived from this information included Hitler himself and the Nazis. Today, these types of conspiracy theories can be found on Islamist websites. I categorically condemn those theories. In fact, one of the basic themes of this book is to uncover the origin and nature of those false theories and to reject the collectivist mindset that undergirds those theories.

This is why I am not going to go any further into this issue than I already have and there is plenty of more information that is available on the topic. I do not want to quote from anti-Semites even when they get their facts right. Nevertheless, it is an absolute and documented fact that many Jews did involve themselves in Bolshevism and many who did rose to the highest levels in the Bolshevik government. It is also a fact that this

influenced anti-Semitism in post World War I Europe. Many other Jews, while not communist, sympathized with communism in those years and some still do. I believe that as Jews, we are better off honestly airing this topic and exposing the truth. By doing so, we defang and defenestrate the collectivist minded anti-Semites. It is no more anti-Semitic to engage in a full airing regarding the number of Jews involved in Bolshevism than it is would be anti-German to discuss the Nazi past. While many Germans sympathized with aspects of Nazism, most Germans were not Nazis. Likewise, it is not anti-Arab or anti-Islamic to engage in a full discussion of the true nature of al-Qaeda, of Osama bin Laden, of the September 11 2001 hijackers or of the radical Islamic jihad against the western democracies.

In an article published in the *Illustrated Sunday Herald* (London), February 8, 1920 entitled *Zionism versus Bolshevism*, Winston Churchill, who at the time was serving as Minister of War in the British government of Lloyd George, is quoted as describing Bolshevism as a *conspiracy for the overthrow of civilization and for the reconstitution of society on the basis of arrested development, of envious malevolence, and impossible equality*.

Regarding the Jews, and as proof that such understandings were widespread in Europe, Churchill, in the Sunday Herald article is quoted as having said: *There is no need to exaggerate the part played in the creation of Bolshevism and in the actual bringing about of the Russian Revolution by these international and for the most part atheistical Jews. It is certainly a very great one; it probably outweighs all others. With the notable exception of Lenin, the majority of the leading figures are Jews. Moreover, the principal inspiration and driving power comes from the Jewish leaders. Thus Tchitcherin, a pure Russian, is eclipsed by his nominal subordinate, Litvinoff, and the influence of Russians like Bukharin or Lunacharski cannot be compared with the power of Trotsky, or of Zinovieff, the Dictator of the Red Citadel (Petrograd), or of Krassin or Radek -- all Jews. In the Soviet institutions the predominance of Jews is even more astonishing. And the prominent, if not indeed the principal, part in the system of terrorism applied by the Extraordinary Commissions for Combatting Counter-Revolution [the Cheka] has been taken by Jews and in some notable cases by Jewesses.* (5.)

Hungarian communist Bela Kun, who carried out a brief and brutal coup in Hungary in 1919 along with his gang of thugs, known as the Lenin Boys, was called a Jew even though he was not Jewish. His father was of Jewish background, his mother Christian. After the collapse of Kun's disastrous Soviet Hungarian government, which had held power for five bloody months, the Bolsheviks put Kun in charge of a revolutionary committee in the Crimea where he was involved in a series of atrocities against Ukrainians and Kulaks. Eugen Levine, of Jewish parentage, led a communist

uprising in Bavaria and established a Bavarian Soviet Republic which lasted for about 4 weeks, April-May 1919. The Bavarian communists were defeated by the German Army.

Several prominent German communist Jews including Rosa Luxemburg and Paul Levi founded the German Spartacist League which became the Soviet allied German Communist Party and which attempted a coup in Berlin in 1919 immediately following the defeat of Germany in World War I. It should be re-iterated that these leaders of uprisings, in the wake of the German defeat in the World War and with the specter of Russian Communism looming just east of the border, were dreaded and feared figures in Europe. The fact that they were associated in the public mind as Jews did not help matters with regard to the encouragement of already existing anti-Semitism. The newly formed Nazi Party was all too eager to step into the vacuum of a collapsed Germany and fan the flames of anti-Semitism. The Nazis wasted no time in highlighting the involvement of Jews in the communist threat, a theme they continued to hammer away at from their 1919 founding until their final defeat in 1945 which brought about the end of World War II. As it would turn out, most of the Jewish Bolshevik leaders themselves would finally get a taste of their own medicine when Josef Stalin, not a Jew and himself one of the great anti-Semites of history, had most of the Jewish Bolsheviks executed in show trials the late nineteen thirties and nineteen forties.

Karl Marx played the role of prophet and seer when he wrote the opening line of *The Communist Manifesto: A spectre is haunting Europe — the spectre of communism*. That spectre exploded into the open in 1917. In the middle of the Great War which was the worst conflagration that had ever engulfed Europe, Lenin led the Bolshevik coup against the Republican government of Russia. The new Communist Soviet Union served as the launching pad for communist inspired terror, revolution, and subversion across Europe and eventually across the entire globe. European states reacted to the threat of communism by imposing their own more localized version of socialism, a form that would be contained within their own national boundaries, and that version of socialism was National Socialism otherwise known as Nazism as well as Fascism.

As predicted by communist theoreticians and intellectuals going back to the French Revolution and Spartacus Weishaupt, war, terror, anarchy and the resulting chaos would create an opening for their agenda to transform humanity. The red in the communist flag represents the human blood that would be spilled in the interest of creating and imposing this false and evil system. The color red in the communist flag represents the torrents of human blood that would by necessity accompany the birth pangs that would be followed by the birth of the satanic communist baby. This is an undisputed fact, one that is proudly

touted and expounded upon at intermadible length in one form or another as it permeates all versions and all tracks of communist and Marxist literature. The communists have a name for this tactic, they call it *revolution*.

National Socialism is politically left wing by American standards of limited government and Judeo-Christian morality yet National Socialism and Fascism are systems of government that are less radical, less far left than is communism or international socialism. The National Socialist regime leaves the pretense of private property ownership intact at least in name. While National Socialism permits a fig leaf of control over property and capital, all property, in the de facto sense, is controlled by the National Socialist state which retains the power to arbitrarily tax and to dispose of private property in any way it sees fit. International Socialism, or Communism, on the other hand makes no pretensions with regard to private ownership. All property, all capital, and all industry are openly and proudly confiscated from the individual and from business by the Communist State in the name of *the people*.

The National Socialist system allowed selected and favored industries to continue to operate under private management but those industries were monopolies that were partners with the government. Ultimately, the corporation exists at the behest of the National Socialist government and thus the National Socialist Corporation is charged with doing the bidding of the government. The International Socialist or the Communist state makes no pretension with regard to the ownership of industry or any other form of property, including the individual himself, as everything that exists within its sphere of influence, everything that moves, is outright and unabashedly owned by and run by the Communist State. The state itself is the corporation.

The bottom line is that both socialist systems, both communism and Nazism, strip away the natural rights of the citizen. The United States seems to have in many ways become more inclined toward a National Socialist as opposed to a communist model of socialism and the American left today, which conventionally views itself as holding at least vague sympathies for the old communist model, is actually at the vanguard, perhaps unwittingly, of the push in America in the direction of what would be an American version of National Socialism. So American would this system look, in fact, that the American people would barely even notice the changes at least not initially.

On the Jewish Question and Hitler

To what degree, if any, did the anti-Semitism expressed in the pages of Karl Marx book *On the Jewish Question* influence Adolf Hitler and the Nazi movement? *On the Jewish Question* was first published in German in 1844, the anti-Semitic second part of the essay was re-published in German in 1881, and the entire essay

was re-published and widely disseminated in German language countries and regions in 1890.^(1.) The book was widely disseminated and reproduced in German leftist circles and to the German public in general. Adolf Hitler, who would become the leader of the National Socialist German Workers Party, was born in 1889.

After re-iterating traditional anti-Semitic themes Marx crystallized and thus advanced several anti-Semitic theories. The most damaging contribution of Marx to the anti-Semitic lexicon was his placing the collective blame on the Jews for introducing into the world such basic human characteristics as *practical need, self-interest, and huckstering* while claiming that the *god of the Jews was money*. This is not to claim that variations of these same anti-Semitic themes were not around in his day but Marx gave them a fresh coat of paint and a scientific sounding veneer. This was enhanced as his growing prestige and reputation as the leader of the social revolutionary movement. Marx quite uniquely also blamed the Jews for influencing Christianity and America in the direction of capitalism, a development which he cursed, and later a mantra of the Third Reich.

Before the French Revolution, anti-Semitism in Germany as in the rest of Europe primarily involved theological Christian anti-Semitism. This scenario portrayed the Jews as Christ killers and, additionally, as a stiff necked people who refused to accept the Christian message of salvation. Portions of the Christian world had embraced replacement theology which held that through the divinity of Jesus, Christianity had replaced Judaism as the covenantal faith. Martin Luther, leader of the Protestant Reformation exacerbated this form of anti-Semitism particularly in Germany when he called for the burning of all synagogues. Up until the time of the Napoleon, Jews were segregated into ghettos across most of Europe and were restricted from engaging in various trades and professions through legalized discrimination.

Napoleon Bonaparte got the ball rolling in Germany at the beginning of the 19th Century in terms of ending the ghettos and the discriminating laws and thus emancipating the Jews. The response was that Jews were becoming increasingly integrated into German society and into the German economy and were in many cases becoming leaders in fields of industry, the arts, business and banking. Marx, as evidenced by his essay *On the Jewish Question*, had major problems with these developments. He argued that the entrance of Jews into the professions and into business and trade was because of the *alienating* tendencies of the Jews, tendencies that should be *made impossible*.

At the beginning of the modern era three strains of anti-Semitism emerged and they were theological, racist, and politico-scientific. Theological anti-Semitism is described here and that continues to varying degrees to this day although in considerably modified

form since World War II and the reforms of Vatican II in the early nineteen sixties. Racist anti-Semitism and racism in general, was enhanced by the evolutionary theories of Darwin and his internationally influential book *Origin of Species* which was published in 1859. Putting aside the validity of the science of Darwin's theory, a great subject for another book, the philosophy and politics of the theory was that all living species including the human species were evolving in the direction of a new and superior species. Either that or the species was headed downward toward extinction. Darwin used the term species and race interchangeably both in his magnum opus, *Origin of Species* and in his more explicitly racist book *Decent of Man*. As mentioned earlier, the philosophy of evolution greatly influenced Darwin's enlightenment contemporary Karl Marx in his theory of social and political evolution.

Both Marx and Engels acknowledged Darwin's influence who wrote that the Aboriginal people of Australia were closer to Gorillas than to white people.

While Darwin gave a scientific imprimatur to racism, Marx gave the same imprimatur to politico-scientific anti-Semitism. The irony was that Christian Europe was, in Marx and Darwin's time, moving in the progressive direction of political freedom and personal faith. Marx viewed genuine enlightenment as regressive and as a threat to his authoritarian revolutionary vision, which he sought to preserve and to advance by attempting to turn the Jews into a scapegoat for the alleged problems with society. Perhaps he understood when he wrote *On the Jewish Question*, as did Hitler eighty six years later, that by focusing the attention of the average European on the Jew, the minority within their midst, and by manufacturing reasons why the average European should despise the Jew, the average citizen, already susceptible due to centuries of traditional anti-Semitism, might be more inclined to pay no attention to the philosophy and policies of the authoritarian state.

But perhaps the most damning element of Marx anti-Semitic thesis, and that says a lot given the many calumnies that Marx brought down upon the heads of the Jewish people in his damnable writings, was his claim that ultimately the only form of emancipation possible for the Jews, emancipation being a movement that was underway in his time, would be for Judaism itself to be abolished and *made impossible*. It appears obvious that Hitler and the Nazis embraced this same idea in its entirety and the bizarre fact is that the idea of making Judaism impossible, as a religion and as an ethical and moral system, remains a central idea lurking within the dark recesses of the thinking of many leftists today including many Jewish leftists. In general, the three strains of anti-Semitism usually overlap with each other and are by no means held exclusively.

Yet Hitler loathed Marxism, or at least this was his claim from the time he became associated with the Nazi Party. His expressed hatred for Marxism was not as much based upon

ideological grounds per se, although he unquestionably developed serious disagreements with Marxism, but rather on his perception that Marx was a Jew and that therefore Marxism constituted a Jewish conspiracy. Hitler seemed to have nevertheless embraced much of Marx social and political theories as well as his political anti-Semitism. Regarding anti-Semitism, Hitler and the Nazis added their bizarre crackpot race theories into the mix, theories that were influenced by German occultism, traditional Christian anti-Semitism, the folkish back to nature movement popular in Germany, and the influence of Darwin on German culture.

Many obvious as well as subtle parallels existed between Marx writings and the Nazi attitude toward Jews. Examples include the use of the German title of *On the Jewish Question* which was *Zur Judenfrage* the same term Hitler used in his famous phrase *Endloesung der Judenfrage*, which translates as *Final solution of the Jewish question*. Marx called for Judaism to *dissolve*, using the German word *aufloesen*, which is close to a term used by the Nazis, *Endloesung* or *final solution*.

Both Marx and Hitler were inheritors of radical ideas that had emerged from the darker recesses of the European enlightenment that entered the political arena during the French Revolution of 1789-1799. James H. Billington, author of *Fire in the Minds of Men*, dissected the meaning and the legacy of the French revolutionary slogan "liberty, fraternity, equality." Billington pointed out that the term liberty represented the ideas exemplified by American republicanism, fraternity would come to represent national socialism, which is to say socialism based upon ethnic ties within a centralized and socialized nation-state, and equality, which would come to represent the international socialism and totalitarianism that Marx espoused and that would become manifest in the communist movement. (2.)

Very little is known about Hitler before he became a figure in the Nazi movement in 1920 at the age of thirty. The primary source of information about Hitler during that period comes from his autobiography *Mein Kampf* or *My Struggle* and this is a highly political book that was meant to be a manifesto for the Nazi Party. Like many public figures, Hitler did not actually write the book as has been acknowledged by virtually all historians of the period. What is known about the authorship of *Mein Kampf* is that Hitler dictated much of the content to his assistant Rudolf Hess who took notes, and to his chauffeur and personal aide Emile Maurice as he paced in his apartment at the Landsberg fortress prison and later at an inn in Berchtesgaden. Hitler was in prison for leading the abortive 1923 Beer Hall Putsch in Munich, which was a march on Munich that imitated the successful march on Rome conducted by Benito Mussolini and the Fascists.

Mein Kampf was actually written by Nazi functionaries and should not be viewed as an objective or reliable source of information with regard to biographical information on Hitler. The book was written at a time of Nazi ascendance in Germany and, as such, it was written to publicly present the Nazi movement and not as an accurate portrayal of Hitler as a person. It is reasonable, therefore, to assume that information contained in *Mein Kampf* about Hitler is only true to the degree that the truth fit Nazi purposes. By the mid nineteen twenties, when the book was released, the Nazis were in fierce competition with German communists and were at the same time working to enter into the German mainstream.

It would therefore not have been in the interest of the Nazi Party or in the interest of Hitler to disclose whether or not he had been a communist in the first thirty years of his life yet there is more than circumstantial evidence that he was. What is absolutely certain is that Hitler incorporated the politico-scientific anti-Semitism of Marx into his pseudo-scientific racist and even theological anti-Semitism. Additionally, Hitler and the Nazis were more than casually influenced by the occult which was where they derived their theory of the mythical Aryan race and the biological and evolutionary theory of the Aryan superman. All of this led the Nazis to concoct the deadly hybrid brew of anti-Semitic hate that was unlike anything the world had ever seen before.

It is also undisputable that Nazi Germany was a radical socialist state both in its form and in its practice and that the implementation of the Nazi anti-Semitic program required such a state. Hitler had immersed himself in the study of Marxism during his younger years as a bohemian artist and as a street hustler while living in Vienna before World War I and it is reasonable to assume that his immersion into Marxism included a study of *On the Jewish Question*. (3.) Known to be a voracious reader, there is evidence that Hitler, who was a lifelong vegetarian and a teetotaler, had conducted normal and possibly friendly relationships with Jews during his care-free years in Vienna. (4.)

Hitler moved to Vienna from the Austrian town of Braunau in 1907 where he lived off of an inheritance from his late father, one that allowed him to live comfortably without a job until the outbreak of the World War in 1914 when he enlisted in the German Army. Very little is known about Hitler's life and activities during those years. Many historians have speculated that Hitler may have been a homosexual prostitute during those years but this is sheer speculation. What is known is that Hitler lived the life of a bohemian artist, living off a pension, not working, sleeping late, and that he was involved in the artist community. Hitler developed a lifestyle in Vienna that continued for the rest of his life. While this is admittedly an opinion drawn from popular stereotypes, it could be considered from what is little known

about Hitler during his time in Vienna that he was likely a communist intellectual. Little is known about Hitler during the war other than that he distinguished himself in action twice and that he had received the Iron Cross First Class.

Hitler was viewed as odd and aloof by his fellow soldiers and in spite of his brave actions as a courier, and for reasons that are not known, Hitler never advanced above the rank of corporal. This lack of advancement could have been as a result of his possible left-wing political orientation.

There is credible evidence to suggest that Hitler supported the Bavarian socialist regime of Kurt Eisner in the period immediately following the November 1918 armistice that ended the war. After the defeat of Germany in November 1918, Hitler returned to Munich shortly after Kurt Eisner, a left-wing leader of the Independent Social Democratic Party of Germany (USPD) declared Bavaria to be a free state and a Socialist Republic on November 8, 1918. Eisner, who was assassinated on his way to submit his resignation to German authorities on February 21, 1919, had overthrown the seven centuries old Wittlesbach monarchy and had formed an alliance with the Soviet Union. The assassination of Eisner was followed in short order by an uprising that led to the brief and violent establishment of a Bavarian Soviet Republic under Eugen Levine which lasted from April to May, 1919. It had been reported at the time, and a photograph presently exists that seems to indicate that Hitler marched in Kurt Eisner's funeral procession. (5.)

The Freikorps, made up of German army personnel returning from the war, and under the command of German General Franz Ritter von Epp, responded to the attempted Soviet takeover in Bavaria by marching into Munich in May, 1919. The short lived Bavarian Soviet Republic was crushed, many of its leaders were executed, and thousands of its irregulars were imprisoned. Along with thousands of other soldiers, Hitler was arrested by the German government at the time and assumedly was arrested and detained for his support of the Soviet uprising although the exact reasons for his arrest have never been clear. It appears that Hitler, assumedly in order to save his own reputation, volunteered to serve the German government as a spy and to identify other soldiers who had supported the two Bavarian socialist regimes in exchange for his freedom. Hitler was subsequently transferred to an official commission investigating the Bavarian uprisings. The obvious question that remains from the confusion and chaos that resulted from these fast breaking events was exactly how did Hitler know who to turn into the authorities as supporters of either the Eisner or the Levine governments? (6.)

In July 1919, Hitler was appointed as a political spy by the Bavarian authorities and was asked to infiltrate the small and recently formed German Workers Party. The authorities were concerned that the new party might be a communist cell and

they perhaps had information that caused this concern. Hitler, who would subsequently join the party, was impressed by the party leader Anton Drexler who favored a strong central government, what he called a non-Jewish version of Socialism and a strong spirit of fraternity amongst all Germans. (7.) Hitler rapidly rose to a leadership position within the party where he first assumed the position as chief of propaganda. One of his first efforts in that position was to suggest that the word "socialist" be incorporated into the name of the party. (8.) The German language is structured in such a way that when an organization has two names the second name is the formal name and the first name is a descriptive qualifier of the first name. Thus the term National Socialist was understood to mean the Socialist party and was Nationalist in its socialist nature.

In February 1920, the Nazi Party under Hitler's leadership and with his direct participation issued its manifesto known as the 25 points. This revolutionary socialist platform both defined Nazism as a socialist movement and at the same time differentiated it from Russian Bolshevism and international socialism. If the hyper-nationalism and the formal anti-Semitism are removed from the document, the 25 points are virtually indistinguishable from other socialist manifestoes. Rather than a call for a worldwide ant colony analogous to the Marxist and Bolshevik idea, the first six points of the plan called for the ethnic and racial supremacy of all Germans living in an expanded Greater Germany. The Nazi manifesto removed the rights of non-Germans in the same way that the Communist Manifesto and the policies of Lenin and Stalin removed the rights of those deemed by the Dictatorship of the Proletariat to be enemies of the people or not politically correct.

The origins of the 25-point Nazi plan reveal in stark language the socialist and revolutionary nature of Nazism. The manifesto was originally devised and endorsed by the Austrian National Socialist party in May, 1918. The Austrian National Socialists and their Bohemian-Sudeten German counterpart formed political organizations before World War I. These parties formally merged with the Nazi party in 1930 by recognizing Hitler as fuehrer. The Austrian and Sudeten parties were essentially German labor parties. The Austrian manifesto claimed to be a *liberal and strictly folkic party fighting against all reactionary efforts, clerical, feudal, and capitalistic privileges; but, before all, against the increasing influence of the Jewish commercial mentality which encroaches on public life*. Besides coming out against capitalism, the manifesto also reflects Marx Politico-scientific anti-Semitism as expressed in *On the Jewish Question* when it railed against the *Jewish commercial mentality*. The Austrian manifesto went on to demand the *amalgamation of all European regions inhabited by Germans, into a democratic and socialized Germany*.

The 25-point Nazi plan resonated with the collectivist tradition including calls for the *nationalization of all trusts, profit sharing*

in large industries, a generous increase in old-age pensions, the immediate communalization of large stores, and agrarian reform in accordance with our national requirements. The 25 points, in a slightly less radical plan than the one that was operating in Bolshevik Russia at the time called for *a law to expropriate the owners without compensation of any land needed for the common purpose, the abolition of ground rents, and the prohibition of all speculation in land.* The Nazis were not as radical as the Bolsheviks who expropriated all property without any compensation and who controlled all rights. The anti-Semitism of the Nazis was more impatient than that of Marx, as expressed in *On the Jewish Question*, as Marx assumed that Judaism would simply dissolve on its own once society entered into the exalted stage of socialism while the Nazis eventually settled on more forceful and direct measures to ensure that Judaism was, to use Marx term, *dissolved*.

The 25 points demanded that *ruthless war be waged against those who work to the injury of the common welfare.* This type of phraseology is very reminiscent of Marx and the principle enunciated is classic socialism. The elite, whether Nazi or communist, thus grants itself the extraordinary and arbitrary fiat power to wage war against anyone or any group they deem to be in any way acting against the interests of the common welfare however the term is defined. *Traitors, usurers, profiteers, etc., are to be punished with death, regardless of creed or race.* Again, in classic socialist revolutionary style, this directive grants the government the right to execute anyone deemed to be an enemy of the state. This also has echoes of Marx political anti-Semitism which he expanded to include the loose and invented category that he called the bourgeois in *The Communist Manifesto*.

The 25 points demand that *Roman law, which serves a materialist ordering of the world, be replaced by German common law.* This is a call to replace the western system of private ownership and individual rights that had developed since Roman times with the pre-Christian pagan German system of collective ownership, and collective guilt, a system that never actually existed except in the fecund imaginations of enlightenment philosophers such as Jean Jacques Rousseau, socialists such as Marx and Frederic Engels, and Nazis such as Hitler.

Point number 20 calls for the State to *assume the responsibility of organizing thoroughly the entire cultural system of the people. The curricula of all educational establishments shall be adapted to practical life. The conception of the State Idea (science of citizenship) must be taught in the schools from the very beginning. We demand that especially talented children of poor parents, whatever their station or occupation, be educated at the expense of the State.* This point expressed an agenda that was started in Germany during the Second Reich government of the Iron Chancellor

Otto von Bismarck, one of Hitler's early idols, and that was state control over the culture and education and therefore of the minds of its citizens from an early age. Certainly, this type of system was implemented by Lenin and by Stalin in Russia, as the Soviet polytechnic system, and was admired by authoritarian and socialistic minded American educators, the so-called frontier thinkers headed by the American socialist thinker known and admired as the father of so-called progressive education John Dewey. In communist nomenclature, this program might be called public ownership of the means of communication and education.

Point 21 declares that the *State has the duty to help raise the standard of national health*. In Nazi parlance, this meant the right of the state to decide who lived and who died. The Nazis would proceed to establish *health courts*, which were government panels made up of government paid experts who would be empowered to legally decide on a case-by-case basis who was living a life that served the interest of the state. Nationalized health control policy would serve as the very cornerstone of the entire socialist enterprise.

Given the fact that socialism required *public ownership of the means of production* as a basic condition to move society in the direction of collectivism, the idea of literally controlling, by means of legal power, the right to live would be the ultimate expression of the socialist idea, what the Nazis might refer to as the *science of citizenship*.

Point 22 serves as the most important political axiom of any socialist society and that is *We demand the abolition of the regular army and the creation of a national (folk) army*. This had already been implemented in Russia with the Cheka under Felix Dzerzhinsky and this would be implemented in Nazi Germany with the creation of the Gestapo. The United States was careful to avoid national police forces as in America as traditionally, in America; the responsibility for policing has resided with the local community and with the county Sheriff. The American

Constitution guarantees the natural right of the citizen to keep and bear arms as a part of a natural system of checks and balances against the encroachments of the national government. Germany during the Weimar Republic pre Nazi period had disarmed the citizenry and had outlawed the private ownership of firearms under the guise of public safety. This was why the Gestapo, the folk army, was able to break down the doors of German Jews without fear that the father on the other side of the door might be able to stop them and to defend himself and his family with a gun.

Point 23 ended freedom of the press or what the Marxist might call public ownership of the means of communication. *We demand that there be a legal campaign against those who*

propagate deliberate political lies and disseminate them through the press. In the United States, if a person is lied about in the press, the citizen reserves the right to commence a lawsuit on the grounds of libel or slander. In the socialist sense, Nazi or Communist, this means a legal campaign against anyone, or any group, that is deemed to be lying by the party in control. Point 23 goes on to state that *Newspapers transgressing against the common welfare shall be suppressed. We demand legal action against those tendencies in art and literature that have a disruptive influence upon the life of our folk, and that any organizations that offend against the foregoing demands shall be dissolved.* This is another hallmark of socialism, whether Nazi or Communist, in that freely expressed opinion, even free thought, can become criminal, or viewed as a hate crime or some other euphemism, if the authorities determine that the opinion falls into that category.

Point 24 appears to be the one most directly influenced by Marx essay *On the Jewish Question: We demand freedom for all religious faiths in the state, insofar as they do not endanger its existence or offend the moral and ethical sense of the Germanic race.* This has also been a hallmark of socialism, both Nazi and Communist, in that the State allows religion to function as a ceremonial devise, a means for citizens to mark holidays and special occasions, while the State controls the actual content and the philosophy, the morality of the faith thus, in both Nazi and in Communist societies religion is allowed to continue in name and in form but the substance of the faith is replaced by the doctrine of the State. This is also an attack on Judaism which in the Nazi context would *offend the moral and ethical sense of the Germanic race.* The communist version of this might call the alleged offending group as obstructing the moral and ethical sense of *the people.* *The party as such represents the point of view of a positive Christianity without binding itself to any one particular confession.*

Point 24 goes on to state that Germany will fight *against the Jewish materialist spirit within and without, and is convinced that a lasting recovery of our folk can only come about from within on the principle: COMMON GOOD BEFORE INDIVIDUAL GOOD.* This is pure Marxism and could very well have been extracted right out of the pages of *On the Jewish Question.* At his point, a recantation of that text should serve to refresh the memory *Let us consider the actual, worldly Jew -- not the Sabbath Jew, as Bauer does, but the everyday Jew. Let us not look for the secret of the Jew in his religion, but let us look for the secret of his religion in the real Jew. What is the secular basis of Judaism? Practical need, self-interest. What is the worldly religion of the Jew? Huckstering. What is his worldly God? Money. Very well then! Emancipation from huckstering and money, consequently from practical, real Jewry, would be the self-emancipation of our time....* Point 25 was simply a call for a

strong centralized totalitarian co-called *scientific* government that the socialist believed would be required in order to enforce all of the above list of new and allegedly progressive laws.

Gregor and Otto Strasser along with Joseph Goebbels, Ernst Rohm, Gottfried Feder and Walther Darre made up the core of the left wing of the Nazi Party. The conflict between this faction and Hitler's faction was, as is often the case with disputes between left oriented political factions, one of tactical as opposed to ideological differences. Conflicts amongst socialist revolutionary groups are often driven by a combination of the personal ambitions and the rivalries of members as well as arguments over how quickly the targeted society should be pushed in the collectivist and authoritarian direction. This is as opposed to any real or discernible ideological differences.

Hitler was not as left wing as the Strasser faction within the Nazi Party because he sought to work within the German system to a greater degree than did Strasser and that included working with German corporations and industrialists. Rather than outright revolution and the virtual takeover of corporations and private property Hitler, who was elected Chancellor in 1933, formed tactical alliances with corporations in a manner similar to the one employed in Italy by his mentor Mussolini. The Strasser faction dominated the Nazi Party from its founding in 1920 until Strasser and several of his Nazi allies were murdered as part of the Night of the Long Knives which took place June 30 and July 2, 1934. Historians have suggested that Gregor Strasser was likely the author of *Mein Kampf*. A brilliant organizer, Strasser expanded membership in the party from 27,000 centered in Bavaria in 1925 to more than 800,000 in 1931, a nationwide reach that was centered in northern Germany. Strasser did this with an anti-capitalist and socialist agenda as the main recruiting tool.

The Night of the Long Knives settled scores for Hitler as he arranged the murders of rivals. The SS and the Gestapo carried out the purge in a manner reminiscent of actions previously taken in Russia by Lenin and his Cheka. Gregor Strasser's brother Otto, living in exile and considered by the Nazis to be a key enemy wrote that he believed that one of the reasons Hitler launched the purge was to erase certain aspects of his own personal past including his previous communist connections. Goebbels and Himmler, originally part of the Strasser faction, had cast their lot with Hitler several years before the purge.

How left wing were the Nazi's? To answer this question it would be instructive to delve briefly into the complex thicket of political distinctions between left and right. The theory presented here is that the right stands for limited government and individual responsibility and that the furthest right possible is anarchy or no government. The left stands for bigger and more authoritarian

government, more government involvement in areas of business, health, education, welfare, and that the furthest left possible is communism or total government. This definition could be viewed as a circle as, from the left, the belief is that the world would have to undergo the political and social stage known as communism, which is total government dictatorship over all property and over all aspects of the life of the citizen in order for human society to then advance into its final utopian stage, to let go of all government altogether and to thus live in a collectivized world society with no government at all and at peace with nature. Marx believed that the totalitarian communist stage in societal development would cause government to eventually *with*er away. Therefore, the result of the Communist ideal would be anarchy, or no government, and thus the far left and the far right come together and meet in a completed and unbroken circle.

While it is universally acknowledged that the left is authoritarian in nature, and that leftism involves the gradual move toward authoritarian government, it is often argued, quite falsely, that the right is also authoritarian. This argument deserves a response. Firstly, it should be stated, that the history of human civilization is a history of authoritarian government going back to the ancient times of the Egyptian Pharaoh and of the Babylonian Empire of Nebuchadnezzar. In fact, the basic component of human political and social progress, in the real meaning of the term, has been for humanity to gradually loosen the bonds of earthly man-directed authoritarianism and to move toward systems of governing that allow for the maximum level of individual freedom. History and faith indicate that the process of human society progressing and thus moving toward individual rights and limited government was first launched with the experience of the Children of Israel after they had freed themselves from chattel slavery in Egypt and had reached the foot of Mt. Sinai.

In order to proceed, it should be noted that whether the reader is religious or secular, a believer or a non-believer is beside the point in the context of this argument. The laws of the Torah, codified in the three great monotheistic faiths, from a philosophical as opposed to necessarily from a theological standpoint were laws that set human society in the direction of self-determination and away from authoritarian earthly control by government. The Torah, regardless of whether it is divine or written by politicians, or exactly when and under what conditions it was written, presented a blueprint for how the individual was to live and how nations were to interact with each other. As such, the Torah could be viewed as the world's first constitution and this is putting aside for the sake of argument the many theories that other scrolls preceded it.

The Torah was, and remains, a blueprint that instructs individuals, and nations in terms of how to interact with each other, which relationships are permitted and which are

forbidden, and how individuals are generally to treat each other in business and in personal life. The Torah instructs humankind in terms of how to establish a calendar, how to purchase property, how nations are to interact in wartime and in peacetime, labor laws, life and death issues, and a whole host of ethical and moral precepts. The Torah establishes separations in property, time, interactions, transactions, and national borders between nations. While on the face of it, the Torah might seem to some to be authoritarian the exact opposite is true. By establishing a series of objective laws guiding individuals and nations in their conduct, the Torah has the salutary effect of freeing mankind from the arbitrary and authoritarian rule of Kings or absolute rulers. It is impossible or very difficult, given the premise that the Torah is the word of God or the word of nature if you will, for earthly rulers to thus tamper with it or to claim superiority over it.

The progressive history of man has consisted of the various milestones achieved over centuries and millennia in which more people became free to be themselves and to determine their own individual future and destiny. In this sense, the Torah started the ball rolling by abolishing such pagan practices for its followers as the worship of graven images, idols that could be manipulated by governments to subject their citizens to their will, and by abolishing human sacrifice. The laws in the Torah regarding how slaves were to be treated got the ball rolling in terms of the eventual emancipation of slaves although this would take several thousand millennia and slavery remains in existence to this day in some countries. The Torah established the principle of private property ownership when the Patriarch Abraham purchased a plot of land in order to bury his wife Sarah and his family. Private property ownership would prove to be a fundamental building block of freedom and this was enhanced once western societies rejected the idea that an individual could own another individual as a slave.

The ancient Greeks and the Romans advanced notions of individual rights with their philosophy and laws. The European Renaissance was all about the emerging rights of the individual and this process of individual rights received major boosts first with the Magna Carta in England, then with the Mayflower Compact in Massachusetts, and finally with the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution in America. The essential concept of American democracy is anti-authoritarian. Thomas Jefferson articulated that concept in the Declaration of Independence when he wrote that *We are endowed by our creator*. This was an acknowledgement that rights came from a *creator* and not from the state and that, as such, the individual possessed natural or *self-evident* rights that transcended the limited powers granted by the people to the state. The American concept, revolutionary in the true meaning of the term, was that government was instituted to preserve, protect, and defend those natural rights,

rights that were assumed inherent to the individual. That the individual would ultimately answer to the *creator* and not to the state.

American independence was truly revolutionary in that it reversed the authoritarian principle of the divine right of Kings. The assumption in the heretofore existing societies was that rights came from the King, or the state and the King exercised the fiat privilege to grant rights to the citizen, or remove rights, based on arbitrary whim. The genuinely progressive movement toward individual rights has been conducted primarily in America, influenced by Judeo-Christian moral principles and the idea that the individual has the basic right to believe, or not believe in God and that faith, as it was originally intended, would not become an instrument in the hands of the authoritarian state. In America, this was also made possible by the ingenious system of checks and balances contained in the Constitution, which constitutes a government of laws and not of men, and the concept of subsidiary. This means that legislative decisions dealing with property, morality, the environment, and social questions are made by local and state officials elected to state legislatures and that those decisions have to square with the state and the federal constitution.

America has been thus the setting for continued advancements in individual rights and, for this reason, America has been and remains a nation and a society that is politically and culturally right of center. Examples of movements that have resulted from an enhanced awareness of the value of individual rights have been the Civil Rights movement, which called for equal opportunity for African-Americans, the Feminist movement, which called for equal rights for women, the pro-life movement, the Gay rights movement, the environmental movement, and most recently the Tea party movement. All of these genuinely conservative movements have expanded individual rights for people and, to varying degrees; all of these movements have been tainted by the regressive influence of the authoritarian left.

Thus, from an American perspective, both Nazism and Communism are left wing. This is because both Nazism and Communism stood for a regressive return to authoritarian forms of government to differing degrees. Obviously, Hitler did not stand for limited government nor did Italian Fascist Dictator Benito Mussolini stand for individual rights. Nazism would be to the right of Communism simply because Nazism was not as radically left wing, not as authoritarian, as was Bolshevik Communism. Hitler left a semblance of private ownership and individual rights in place, at least in appearance and only for Germans, while Stalin went for the outright forced collectivization of all property and the confiscation of all individual rights. For this reason, both Nazism and Communism are to the left of European liberalism and to the far left of American free-market capitalism.

In post World War I Germany, the Nazis were to the right of the Communists but they were to the left of the German industrialist establishment and they were to the left of the monarchists. While the World War I government of Kaiser Wilhelm II was authoritarian and socialistic, and as such the German Empire was far to the left of America, Wilhelmine Germany was nevertheless to the right of the Bolshevik regime of Lenin and would have been to the right of the much more authoritarian and socialistic regime of Hitler. Before World War I Mussolini was a communist professor. After the war, and as he contemplated a takeover of Italy, he concluded that the Bolshevik style of government would not work in Italy which was a country made up of private corporations, small landowners and businessmen, Catholic traditions, and a history of small and independent city-states.

Thus, Mussolini devised a third way by combining capitalism with socialism and establishing a political movement that he called Fascism. He would launch a revolutionary socialist government in Italy in the post war period but would leave in place the corporations, the small businesses, and the Pope. Rather than attempting to take over the corporations and the labor unions, and rather than following in the open path of Lenin, Mussolini devised a system by which he granted select corporations monopolies and welcomed them to participate in the government itself. Mussolini thus developed an unelected National Council of Corporations with himself as the chairman who would serve as part of his government in a manner that might very loosely be compared to the role of American president's cabinet. Hitler was inspired by Mussolini's example, as was, ironically, American President Franklin D. Roosevelt. (9.)

Roosevelt was in no way as far left as were his European contemporaries Hitler and Mussolini. America retained its constitution, its system of checks and balances, the two parties, the states, local police as opposed to national police, and private business and property remained strong and uninterrupted in the American Republic. Nevertheless Roosevelt, while essentially remaining a great American patriot committed to American principles, nevertheless introduced a regressive and authoritarian strain into American politics and culture, a strain that had not visited the American shore since the reign of the English tyrant, King George III.

Roosevelt changed the way Americans viewed their government as under Roosevelt's leadership Americans began to look to government as an agent of change and as a powerful force as opposed to as an entity that had to be constricted and limited. Roosevelt used executive power to introduce government agencies with legal power into an unprecedented number of areas in American life. The cultural change was dramatic as since the New Deal era, Americans have become

accustomed to looking to the government to handle areas of life that had previously been handled by the private individual.

Roosevelt had set the tone for the regressive European style of centralizing power in America. In a 1912 speech he delivered to the Peoples Forum, Troy, NY, Roosevelt revealed his philosophy of government when he praised the German Empire: *They passed beyond the liberty of the individual to do as he pleased with his own property and found it necessary to check this liberty for the benefit of the freedom of the whole people.* (10.)

In his inaugural address in 1933, Roosevelt called for emergency powers to be placed into his hands as President: *We are, I know, ready and willing to submit our lives and property to such discipline, because it makes possible a leadership which aims at a larger good. I assume unhesitatingly the leadership of this great army....I shall ask the Congress for the one remaining instrument to meet the crisis—broad executive power to wage a war against the emergency, as great as the power that would be given to me if we were in fact invaded by a foreign foe.*

After the catastrophe of World War I, a war that had lasted from August 14, 1914 to November 11, 1918, and a war that resulted in more carnage and destruction than any previous war known to man, the western democracies responded by turning in the regressive direction of the authoritarian left and this leftward turn included the Roosevelt Administration although, it should be noted, Roosevelt was much more centrist and moderate than his European contemporaries. The world war, the destruction and broken lives that it left in its wake, the economic depression, the German inflation, V.I. Lenin's far left-wing coup in Russia and communist attempts to expand into Europe, all of these factors had taken a heavy toll on a populace that was more susceptible to those who called for more centralized and authoritarian government as a solution. Capitalism became the scapegoat and the charges made by Karl Marx against the Jews in *On the Jewish Question*, while remaining focused on Jews in Europe, and came to include all capitalists and the capitalist system in general.

Many western intellectuals and elites, as well as many people whose lives were destroyed or seriously disrupted from the conflagration, the economic depression, and sense of dislocation caused by World War I came to believe that capitalism had failed. This was a time when people felt out of control over their own destiny and looked for an enemy to blame. For the conventional liberal, Marx accusation of a Jewish conspiracy thus morphed into a belief in a general capitalist conspiracy. The rise of hyper nationalist and socialistic empires in Europe, the clash of these centralized and competing mega-states in a World War, and the emergence into the daylight of the revolutionary socialist conspiracy in Russia were all generally factors that were overlooked as the cause of the war and the world crisis. Instead, the western democracies blamed the small shop owner, the

private property owner, the industrial corporation that had created the goods and services that had moved society forward, the private owners of capital.

In the case of the Bolshevik Communists the scapegoat, literally, became the private owner of capital and thus the totalitarian regime of Lenin and Stalin seized and collectivized all property and capital and murdered the millions of innocent people who were perceived as standing in the way. In the case of the Nazis, the capitalist scapegoat was inextricably tied to the Jews in a manner that was reminiscent of the second half of Marx essay *On the Jewish Question*. Of course, the Nazis added their own unique and sinister components to anti-Semitism as Marx political and *scientific* anti-Semitism was only one piece of the Nazi anti-Semitic construct.

The Nazis also drew from traditional Christian and German anti-Semitism as well as from the scientific crackpot race theories that emanated from the theories of the 19th century naturalist Charles Darwin and from Darwin's cousin and collaborator Francis Galton, who invented the pseudo-science of eugenics.

The terrible and despicable regime of Adolf Hitler, the horrors of World War II and the Holocaust against the Jews of Europe were events that so shocked the world that it is often difficult to look objectively and dispassionately at the causes of such unspeakable events. Yet such an examination is essential as a means of preventing such events from ever occurring again which is why such an examination must proceed without apology or equivocation. The contention of this author is that Nazi Germany was viewed as, essentially, a socialistic and progressive society from the period of Hitler's election in 1933 until the outbreak of the war in August of 1939.

Furthermore, had Hitler, God forbid, won the war, Nazism would probably be viewed today as just another idealistic and progressive experiment that failed in the same way as many consider the Soviet Union and Communist China as having been well meaning and idealistic social experiments that failed. This view leaves the door open for another socialistic experiment somewhere in the world with the hope, on the part of the so-called progressives, that next time the experiment gets it right. The stock belief today in terms of what caused the Nazi Holocaust against the Jews was that it was as a result of the anti-Semitism of Hitler and that of the Nazis and this is, of course, absolutely true.

Yet this does not tell the whole story. Anti-Semitism had been around since time immemorial yet nothing of the scale of the Holocaust had ever occurred before. The fact is that the Holocaust against the Jews of Europe occurred because anti-Semitism became the official doctrine of German state. That fact,

along with the development of a total state operating on socialist principles, particularly the socialistic insistence on a monopoly of state control, or what Marxism refers to as public ownership of the means of production, made the Holocaust possible. The same principle made the murders of tens of millions of innocent people possible in the Soviet Union, in Communist China and virtually all of the other so-called progressive Marxist inspired socialist states. When the sovereign rights of the private individual are sacrificed on the altar of the state, for any reason, then the state is given the fiat power to do anything it chooses to do, and that means anything that those who control the levers of power deem to be in the interests of *the people*.

On the Jewish Question – Apologists

The defenders of *On the Jewish Question* appear to have been for the most part motivated by ideology and not by concern with evidence or the truth. In certain critical ways, this makes the defenders of *On the Jewish Question* not very different from those who defend the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* or *Mein Kampf*. Taking the discussion one step further, it could be argued that the deniers of the true nature of the anti-Semitism contained within *On the Jewish Question* could be compared to those who deny the nature of Nazism and even of the causes of the Nazi Holocaust against the Jews of Europe. In fact, some of the followers of Marx, those who instituted communist regimes and those who defended those regimes have often denied equally atrocious genocides against the respective populations of those communist countries. This is not to say that the deniers are not sincere and well-meaning believers in Marx vision but those sincere deniers would be *useful idiots*, to use a phrase coined by VI Lenin, one of Marx chief disciples. *The* witting participants in the communist genocides, however, should not be offered such a pass.

The classic Marxist apologia for *On the Jewish Question* is actually not an apologia at all in terms of addressing the anti-Semitism of Marx. The general approach on the left has been to argue that that *On the Jewish Question* was actually a critique of capitalism rather than of Judaism and of course, this would be a half truth. The deeper problem with this type of analysis is that Marx inextricably intertwines Judaism with capitalism under the guise that capitalism constitutes a Conspiracy to exploit working people. Yet many commentators on the left ask their adherents to read the anti-Semitism of *On the Jewish Question* in the context of anti-Capitalism as if the Jewish element either didn't exist or that Marx really didn't mean it. Another typical refrain is that anti-Semitism was pervasive in Marx time so therefore Marx is not to be held to a double standard.

Abram Leon's book *The Jewish Question: A Marxist*

Interpretation, published in 1946, is actually an excellent examination of Jewish social and economic history. Leon, while completely embracing the communist ideas of Marx, virtually ignored Marx anti-Semitism except in a few instances. Leon started his political career as a member of the Belgian branch of Hasomer Hat air, a left wing Zionist youth group, but he rejected Zionism in 1940, the year Belgium was occupied by the Nazis, and became a Trotskyist joining the Fourth International. Leon, who was tragically murdered at the Auschwitz death camp at the young age 27 in June, 1944, railed against both the Nazi occupation and against what he referred to as the militarism of British Prime Minister Winston Churchill. Analyzing Marx book Leon, endorsing Marx refutation of the Jewish faith, wrote that one *must not start with religion in order to explain Jewish history; on the contrary: the preservation of the Jewish religion or nationality can be explained only by the 'real Jew', that is to say, by the Jew in his economic and social role.* (1.)

Leon agreed with Marx analysis that Judaism was not essentially a religion but that it was rather a socio-economic condition. Leon did not agree with Marx anti-Semitic contention that Judaism was the source of *huckstering, self-interest, and money* and that the elimination of Judaism would eliminate these traits from human consciousness. Leon wrote that in Roman times the Jews became a merchant class as a response to social conditions. He further claimed that Jews came to practice, as a response to Christian anti-Semitism, a pre capitalist form of merchant capitalism.

Nevertheless, Leon did pull down an anti-Semitic quote from Marx, which he derived from Marx Magnum Opus, *Capital: The trading nations of the ancients existed like the gods of Epicurus in the intermediate worlds of the universe or rather like the Jews in the pores of Polish society. Both usury and commerce exploit the various modes of production. They do not create it, but attack it from the outside.* This is yet another reminder of Marx distain and loathing not only for Jews but also for the free trade of goods and services, which threatened his abstract theory of the mode of production, which, he believed, should be controlled by the state in the name of the people.

Leon viewed Judaism as simply a socio-economic phenomenon not as a religion. As such, he expected Judaism to disappear at the dawn of the glorious new and allegedly progressive socialist age. His analysis of capitalism as having *aggravated the plight of the Jews to an unparalleled degree* was obviously false as evidenced by the success of the Jews, in his time and today, in the United States and in other capitalist economies. Leon can be forgiven for this falsity as he wrote this book while living in Nazi occupied Europe and he no doubt adhered to the conventional view that Nazi Germany was more capitalist than socialist. More problematic in Leon's analysis, and more emblematic of the left, was his choice to simply ignore and

airbrush out of his book virtually any mention of Marx anti-Semitic passages or beliefs. This is typical of revolutionaries who choose to shape reality in the image of what they perceive as in the interest of socialist progress as opposed to adherence to principles of objective truth.

Hyam Maccoby was a respected British Jewish scholar who excelled in the study of anti-Semitism and the early Christian Church. Maccoby considered *On the Jewish Question* to be an example of what he considered as Marx "early anti-Semitism" yet Maccoby, while acknowledging Marx as an anti-Semite, offered no evidence to back up his implied assertion that Marx had shed his anti-Semitism later in life. Maccoby contended that Marx, later in his career, limited his anti-Semitic views to private letters and conversations because of the open anti-Semitism of his socialist rival revolutionaries Pierre-Joseph Proudhon and Mikhail Bakunin and as a reaction to the enduring phenomena of conservative Christian anti-Semitism. Yet, according to Maccoby, Marx clearly never refuted his anti-Semitism or the anti-Semitism of his book *On the Jewish Question*.

Maccoby does not go so far as to claim that Marx in any way changed his views, only that he de-emphasized them publicly because he sensed that they no longer served his interests. Maccoby presented an interesting circumlocution when he justified Marx characterization of Judaism as a "pseudo-religion whose god is money" by claiming that Marx was describing Judaism as triumphant in the modern commercialized world. This technical truth sidestepped the fact that Marx viewed the "commercialized world" as a form of "false consciousness" that should be abolished and that the end of Judaism was a central necessity in that abolition. (2.) Marx wrote in *On the Jewish Question: Emancipation from huckstering and money, consequently from practical, real Judaism, would be the self-emancipation of our time*. Maccoby suggested that his Jewish background embarrassed Marx and that he used the Jews as a "yardstick of evil." Evidence suggests that on this point he was undoubtedly correct. (3.)

Polish Jewish Marxist historian, biographer and theoretician Isaac Deutscher, in an essay published in 1958 entitled *Message of the Non Jewish Jew*, compared Marx to a line of Jewish heretics. His list of heretics included Elisha ben Abuyah, Baruch Spinoza, Heinrich Heine, Rosa Luxemburg, Leon Trotsky, and Sigmund Freud. According to Deutscher, Marx's idea of "socialism and of the classless and stateless society" was as universal a concept as was those held by the heretics in their respective eras. On this point, Deutscher made a fatal error that has since become commonplace and, indeed, has become universally accepted and that was that Judaism was not itself a universal faith. Falsely ascribing this accusation to Spinoza who, while advocating a pantheistic and deist view, one that led him to be excommunicated a Dutch council of Rabbis, remained a

devout Jew for the rest of his life and deeply resented the excommunication. Deutscher wrote that Spinoza had *seized at once the cardinal contradiction in Judaism, the contradiction between the monotheistic and universal God and the setting in which that God appears in the Jewish religion—as a God attached to one people only; the contradiction between the universal God and his chosen people.* (3.)

This falsity should be addressed, as this has been a basic tenet of anti-Semitism both on the left and on the right. There is absolutely no contradiction between the monotheistic and universal God and the God that conveyed the Ten Commandments to Moses at Sinai. The universal one God and the God of Israel is the same. The central understanding, indeed the first two of the Ten Commandments is that there is only one God and that there are no other Gods. The central prayer of Judaism is *Hear o Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is One.* The concept of the chosen people is not one in which the Jews are worshipping a separate God or that the God of the Jews is or has ever been perceived to be an exclusive God to the Jews. God is God. God is God to all of humankind equally and is, indeed, the creator of the universe. Born into a religious family in Poland, Deutscher studies with a Hasidic Rabbi and was steeped in the Torah and Talmud. Only blind ideology could have led him to engage in such an anti-Semitic slander against his own people.

Indeed, it was his Marxist ideology that animated his writings and activities and the central tenet of that ideological advocacy was the promotion of the Marxist concept of universalism. Deutscher, who embraced the creed of communism, would therefore not view the Jewish conception of God as universal simply because the God of Israel gave the “chosen people” a couple of extra assignments. This would mean, from the Marxist standpoint, that the God of Israel had created a separation between peoples and this was anathema to the revolutionary idea which was that the ultimate virtue, indeed the ultimate truth and reality, was that all of mankind should live in a state of collectivism. This political condition, collectivism, was one in which all separations would have been abolished and all of humankind would become de-facto equal and thus at peace within himself and with the natural universe. This concept, as opposed to universalism, contradicted Judaism, which was full of separations starting with the separation between day and night, the weekdays and the Sabbath, men and women, nations, peoples, good and evil, and a long list of other separations.

Deutscher expressed admiration for all of the heretics he lists in his article because of their perceived universalism. What was the universalism advocated by Marx, by Deutscher, and by the other social revolutionaries? Their universalism called for more than simply a one world government although they absolutely did call for that and encouraged violence as a means of achieving that

end. In that sense the European revolutionaries had a lot in common with today's fundamentalist Muslim Jihadists who seek a one world Caliphate under Islamic Sharia law. Marx and his fellow revolutionaries sought a complete transformation of human nature itself, they sought, to use current nomenclature, to "change the world." They also understood that the evolutionary change would require an unprecedented level of violence and, once implemented in one segment of the planet, would require continuous revolution or what Leon Trotsky, the founder of the Red Army in the Soviet Union called permanent revolution. This was used as a euphemism by the revolutionaries for the reign of terror that would be required to constantly root out those deemed to be regressive or enemies of the people.

Deutscher, while leaving out the crude language and hardcore Jew hatred of *On the Jewish Question*, nevertheless agreed with Marx hypothesis and went on to further embellished upon its anti-Semitic themes. In an attempt to explain *On the Jewish Question*, Deutscher wrote in a very suave and sophisticated style that Marx went to the very heart of the matter when he said that *Jewry had survived "not in spite of history but in history and through history," that it owed its survival to the distinctive role that the Jews had played as agents of a money economy in environments which lived in a natural economy, that Judaism was essentially a theoretical epitome of market relationships and the faith of the merchant; and that Christian Europe, as it developed from feudalism to capitalism, became Jewish in a sense.* (6.) Deutscher thus agreed with Marx assertion that the nature of Judaism was self-interest and huckstering and that the God of the Jews was money. He also agreed with Marx that Europe had become Judaized as evidenced by the development of free market capitalism and he no doubt blamed, as did Marx, the Jews for the development of American capitalism.

Elaborating on Marx claim that Christianity had become Judaized by capitalism, which Marx viewed as an exclusively Jewish trait; Deutscher quoted *On the Jewish Question* when he wrote that Marx saw *Christ as the theorizing Jew, the Jew as a practical Christian and, therefore, the practical bourgeois Christian as a Jew. His ideal was not the equality of Jew and Gentile in a "Judaized" capitalist society, but the emancipation of Jew and non-Jew alike from the bourgeois way of life, or, as he put it provocatively in his somewhat over-paradoxical Young Hegelian, idiom, in the "emancipation of society from Jewry."* Thus, Deutscher did not go as far as Marx in terms of claiming that the Jews were responsible for capitalism and that therefore Judaism would have to be abolished in order to eliminate the free market and push human society forward into what he argued was a better paradigm. In fact, using a subtle twist of phrasing, Deutscher attempts to absolve Marx of this obvious smear by referring to it as a *somewhat over-paradoxical Young Hegelian, idiom* and that Marx had written the *famous Zur Judenfrage* in

his youth.

In his essay *Message of the non-Jewish Jew*, Isaac Deutscher, in a very indirect and sophistic style that is typical of modern left-wing revolutionaries, blames the Jews for the Nazi Holocaust. In his exposition on this topic, he could have been channeling Marx from wherever the soul of Marx resides and the degree to which his view of the Holocaust is burrowed within the subconscious minds of the left today, including the Jewish left, is actually quite astonishing. He starts out by claiming that: *It is an indubitable fact that the Nazi massacre of six million European Jews has not made any deep impression on the nations of Europe. It has not truly shocked their conscience. It has left them almost cold.* He then poses the question as to whether therefore the optimism of the heretical Jews of his essay was justified and he answers his own question in the affirmative. He states that their optimism over the future of mankind was justified after the Holocaust *as the belief in the ultimate solidarity of mankind is itself one of the conditions necessary for the preservation of humanity and for the cleansing of our civilization of the dregs of barbarity that are still present in it and poison it.*(7.)

Did those sentiments on the part of Deutsch not exactly mirror the beliefs of the Nazis? Did the Nazis not also believe that *the conditions necessary for the preservation of humanity* would require the *cleansing of our civilization of the dregs of barbarity that are still present in it and poison it*? For Deutscher and for the left, who exactly were those *dregs of barbarity* that needed to be *cleansed*? Whom exactly was he talking about? Was he talking about the tens of millions of people that were *cleansed* out of the Soviet Union or out of Communist China? Were not both revolutionary socialist traditions, those of the Nazis and those of the communists, acting in the interest of their perverted concept of human progress when they respectively *cleansed the dregs of barbarity* from their midst? What, finally, is the essential difference between these two movements?

Deutscher certainly did represent conventional post-war leftist views. The biographer of Stalin and Trotsky, Deutscher first delivered his essay *Message of the non-Jewish Jew* as the text of a speech in 1958. Deutscher was a popular figure in left-wing circles in the 1960's. In 1965, he took part in the first campus protest against the Vietnam War held at the University of California-Berkeley where students listened to his indictment of American engagement in the Cold War. Deutscher was the G.M. Trevelyan Lecturer at Cambridge University in Britain 1966-1967. He lectured at the State University of New York, New York University, and at Princeton, Harvard, and Columbia Universities. His G. M. Trevelyan Lectures were published under the title *The Unfinished Revolution* shortly after his sudden death

in Rome in 1967. The Deutscher Memorial Prize is awarded annually to a book that *exemplifies the best and most innovative new writing in or about the Marxist tradition.* (8.)

Moving toward the punch line in his essay *Message of the non-Jewish Jew*, Deutscher asks the question: *Why then has the fate of the European Jews left the nations of Europe, or the gentile world at large, almost cold?* Then he proceeds to drop his bomb: *Unfortunately, Marx was far more right about the place of the Jews in European society than we could realize some time ago. The major part of the Jewish tragedy has consisted in this, that in result of a long historic development, the masses of Europe have become accustomed to identify the Jew primarily with trade and jobbing, money lending and moneymaking. Of these, the Jew had become the synonym and the symbol to the popular mind.*

Perhaps this factor, more than any other of the innumerable factors that could be named, is the one that finds complete synchronicity between the Nazis and the communists. Starting with Marx and on through Hitler and apparently well into the post-war left, the propaganda that the Jews were to blame for capitalism, a lie that operated under the assumption that the population at large hated capitalism, was a basic article of the socialist faith. Marx called it *self-interest, huckstering, money*, Hitler used uglier terms, and Deutscher made softer references to *trade and jobbing, money lending and money making*. The most damnable lie of all contained within this whole sickening Jew-hating morass, and the most bizarre, is the assumption that average people would have something against the merchant, the shopkeeper, the company owner, the private owner of capital. That the average citizen would hate the merchant that offers them goods and services, the bank that loans them money so they could buy a car or a house, the corporation that employs their son or daughter.

But this was, of course, what Adolf Hitler called the big lie. In *Mein Kampf*, Hitler wrote of the Big Lie as a propaganda technique. Hitler wrote a lie so *colossal* that no one could believe that someone might actually have the nerve to engage in such a deception. The big lie, started by Marx, furthered by Hitler, and promulgated in this case by Deutscher, was that the capitalists were evil, that the capitalists were Jews, and that therefore the Jews were evil. Thus, Deutscher, speaking for Marx as if Marx were alive in the post World War II years, blamed the Jews for the Holocaust because the Jews were capitalists and, as such, were hated by the Europeans to the degree that they put the Jews into the gas chamber. Let us be clear. Adolf Hitler and his Nazi cadre were responsible for the Holocaust against the Jews of Europe and they did it while utilizing the type of propaganda and lies against the Jews at was amplified by Karl Marx in his book *On the Jewish Question*.

However, his essay *Message of the non-Jewish Jew* did not stop there. Deutscher goes on to quote from an old edition of the Oxford Dictionary that contains an anti-Semitic definition of the word Jew and to criticize British Member of Parliament Macaulay for suggesting that a Rothschild who was a prominent Jewish British banker should be seated in the House of Commons. Deutscher referred to Macaulay as a *voice of the bourgeois Christian who took a fresh look at Shylock and hailed him as brother*. It should be noted that Baron Lionel Rothschild played an instrumental role in financing British trade across the world and such laudable projects as the Aswan Dam in Egypt.

Deutscher did not yet let up. He again blamed the Jews for the Holocaust when he wrote: *I SUGGEST that what had enabled the Jews to survive as a separate community, the fact that they had represented the market economy amidst people living in a natural economy—that this fact and its popular memories have also been responsible, at least in part, for the Schadenfreude or the indifference with which the populace of Europe has witnessed the holocaust of the Jews*. Firstly, the market economy is the natural economy. Since caveman days, people have freely traded goods and services. Deutscher implies, as did Marx before him and as do theoretical Marxists, that the *natural economy* is communist and that human society has been deceived into forgetting the greatness of his true nature by the exploiters, in this case the Jew, who seeks to exploit his fellow man to feed his self-interest and need to huckster. Both mean held to the bizarre notion that man should give up his freedom to trade with each other and to turn that responsibility over to the state, which would somehow act in the interest of the people. That ultimately, once man had forgotten such false consciousness as private trading, self-interest etc. than the Dictatorship of the Proletariat would have served its provisional purpose and that all government would *with*er away. Then, and only then, would man live in a state of peace with nature in a new world international beehive.

Isaac Deutscher very much represents the non-Jewish Jew and that representation includes the many Jews who consider themselves to be Jewish but know nothing about what it means to be a Jew. The idea that people should look beyond the artificial separations that they consider religion to be and to rather look to some sort of an amoral and atheistic universal faith is an idea that has become virtually gospel within many very liberal religious communities both Jewish and non-Jewish. This so-called humanistic approach has come to worship the tolerance of others as the central dogma. Who they actually are and, for that matter who those they feel commanded to tolerate, is a subject that is rarely if ever pondered. They view objective understanding of morality as a form of prejudice that might interrupt this tolerance. The underlying theme, submerged within the dark corner and rarely seeing the light of day, is that ultimately, all

that separates individuals and groups should be removed and that humankind, as the ultimate goal, and as the penultimate virtue, should join in a worldwide ant colony.

Shlomo Avineri, a celebrated award winning Israeli journalist, political scientist, and intellectual, a man of the left, wrote several books on Marx and translated some of Marx earlier work into Hebrew. Avineri does not outright ignore Marx' anti-Semitism, which he acknowledges as a well-known fact, but he equivocates by turning attention away from it and rather on Marx support for Jewish emancipation in Europe.(9.) In this endeavor, Avineri offers an example of Marx defending Jewish emancipation in a debate with fellow revolutionary Bruno Bauer who contended that the Jews should abandon Judaism first before obtaining emancipation. In an 1843 letter to German philosopher and political writer Arnold Ruge, Marx wrote that he supported a petition to emancipate German Jewry to the Prussian General Assembly. He explained to Ruge that while he disliked Judaism as a religion, he was nevertheless unconvinced by Bauer's view. The text of the letter seems to indicate that Marx supported Jewish Emancipation for dialectical reasons in that he seemed to think that an emancipated Jewish population in Europe would cause tensions within the Christian community, tensions that he perhaps believed could be exploited in order to develop a new synthesis on the road to socialism.

Louis Althusser, a prolific French communist writer and politician who suffered bouts of mental illness and who murdered his wife, claimed in his 1965 collection of essays entitled *For Marx*, that *On the Jewish Question* was really about Marx theory of alienation which he derived from his fellow Young Hegelian Ludwig Feuerbach's materialist theory of human nature.(10.) Althusser completely ignored the question of anti-Semitism in *On the Jewish Question* by employing a tactic of dividing Marx work into two periods. Althusser maintained that Marx early period, which included *On the Jewish Question*, was not truly Marxist and, as such, it *cannot, theoretically, be identified with the later texts*. For Althusser, *On the Jewish Question* is a *profoundly ideological' text committed to the struggle for Communism but without being Marxist*.(11.) This approach is reminiscent of present arguments used to temporize some of the more extreme and violent aspects of the Koran by claiming that the important part of the book is the first half, which is peaceful, not the second half, which is violent.

University of Kent emeritus Professor of Political Theory David McLellan, the author of several books on Marx including *Marxism after Marx* argued that *On the Jewish Question* should be viewed by parsing words. Thus, Professor McLellan claimed, Marx used the word *Judentum* to mean *commerce* in his argument that Germany should be emancipated from capitalism.

McLellan actually suggests that the more explicitly anti-Semitic second half of *On the Jewish Question* should be read as *an extended pun at Bauer's expense*. (12.) The second half of *On the Jewish Question* is obviously no joke, it is about as funny as a broken leg. The following quote from Marx *On the Jewish Question*, which also reveals his motives for supporting Jewish Emancipation, should be repeated to dispel the ridiculous notion that Marx book was a pun: *What is the secular basis of Judaism? Practical need, self-interest. What is the worldly religion of the Jew? Huckstering. What is his worldly God? Money. Very well then! Emancipation from huckstering and money, consequently from practical, real Jewry, would be the self-emancipation of our time.*

American radical activist and writer Hal Draper, who wrote *Karl Marx Theory of Revolution*, attempted to tie the language in part two of *On the Jewish Question* with the views expressed by Jewish socialist Moses Hess in his essay *On the Money System* and Draper may have been at least partially correct. Hess, who was a Jewish early Zionist socialist and who would author *Rome and Jerusalem* several decades after his involvement with Marx, did indeed write disparagingly on capitalism and his book did include a couple of allusions to Jews that could be described as anti-Semitic. Hess book *Rome and Jerusalem* presciently contended that Jewish emancipation in Europe, particularly in Germany would fail and that the solution was Jewish emancipation in the Jewish ancestral home in Palestine. His book profoundly influenced the development of the modern Zionist movement. Hess knew Marx and his work influenced both Marx and his business partner and collaborator Fredric Engels. Nevertheless a reading of both Hess and Marx indicates that *On the Jewish Question* was unquestionably written in Marx own words and represents a viciousness that was not in Hess. Marx was solely responsible for the contents of his books.

Literary critic, author and scholar Stephen Greenblatt mentioned *On the Jewish Question* in conjunction with Renaissance playwright Christopher Marlowe's play *The Jew of Malta*. Greenblatt drew a similarity between both works use of the image of the perfidious Jew pointing out that both Marlowe and Marx used the image as a means to marshal deep popular hatred. In both cases The Jew, Greenblatt wrote, was *charged not with racial deviance or religious impiety but with economic and social crime, crime that is committed not only against the dominant Christian society but in less "pure" form, by that society. Both writers hope to focus attention upon activity that is seen as at once alien and yet central to the life of the community and to direct against that activity the anti-Semitic feeling of the audience.* Right off the bat it should be clearly noted that Marx was not a playwright trying to elicit the emotions of an audience, which is not to say that he was not trying to reach people. Marx was a stone cold serious polemicist who sought to change the political and social condition of the world. (13.)

Greenblatt goes on to claim that the *Jews themselves in their real historical situation are finally incidental in these works, Marx's as well as Marlowe's, except insofar as they excite the fear and loathing of the great mass of Christians*. Regarding Marx, this strikes me as untrue. The Jews were hardly incidental to *On the Jewish Question* but were rather at the core of its thesis. Marx probably did seek to *excite the fear and loathing of the great mass of Christians* but if this was the case, and it probably was, then Marx viewed this aspect of his thesis as a side benefit, a cherry on top of a sundae, as an aspect of his thesis that could be employed down the road as part of a possible dialectical conflict. Marx clearly fashioned himself as a social scientist and, as such, he sought to identify what he claimed was the true nature of the Jew and to then call for the elimination of the Jews as a means of changing that nature in humanity as a whole.

Regarding Marx anti-Semitism, Greenblatt reasonably speculates that *On the Jewish Question* has *elements of a sharp, even hysterical, denial of his religious background. It is particularly tempting to reduce the latter work to a dark chapter in its author's personal history. Still, the extreme violence of the latter half of Marx's work and his utter separation of himself from the people he excoriates undoubtedly owe much to his personal situation*. This is an interesting question. Why would Marx, who had a Jewish background himself, be so viciously anti-Semitic? In *On the Jewish Question*, Marx legitimizes virtually every form of anti-Semitism in use in his day and then he adds on a couple of new layers. Greenblatt notes that *the tone of the attack on the Jews rises to an almost ecstatic disgust at the moment when Marx seems to be locating the Jews most clearly as a product of bourgeois culture; it is as if Marx were eager to prove that he is in no way excusing or forgiving the Jews*. (14.)

Many others who have reviewed *On the Jewish Question* would fall into the classic left-wing category of mixing denial with obfuscation. This would be bad enough but becomes more egregious when related to hatred and bigotry especially when that hatred directly contributed to genocide. Israeli liberal writer and academic Yoav Peled viewed Marx anti-Semitic motives as *shifting the debate over Jewish emancipation from the plane of theology... to the plane of sociology, thereby circumventing one of Bauer's main arguments*. Peled contended that *On the Jewish Question* was *less than a satisfactory response to Bauer, but it enabled Marx to present a powerful case for emancipation while, at the same time, launching his critique of economic alienation*. Concluding that the *philosophical advances made by Marx in On the Jewish Question were necessitated by, and integrally related to, his commitment to Jewish emancipation*. (15.)

This of course, is an attempt to shunt aside the basic theme of Marx book, which was that Jewish Emancipation, for Marx, meant emancipation of all of human society from Judaism.

Robert Fine is chair of the Sociology Department at Warwick University, Coventry, UK. In a 2006 essay entitled *Karl Marx and the Radical Critique of anti-Semitism* (16.) Professor Fine tried to change the subject when he wrote: *Bauer's essay "echoed the generally prejudicial representation of the Jew as 'merchant' and 'moneymen'", whereas "Marx's aim was to defend the right of Jews to full civil and political emancipation (that is, to equal civil and political rights) alongside all other German citizens.* Professor Fine correctly argues that Bruno Bauer was anti-Semitic in his reference to Jews as *merchant* and *moneymen* yet Fine forgot to mention that Marx anti-Semitic references to Jews made Bauer's references look like nursery rhymes in comparison. Fine generally works the same weird thesis as did his fellow British Professor, University of Kent emeritus Professor of Political Theory David McLellan, in that he views Marx anti-Semitic passages in *On the Jewish Question* as a *witty and deeply ironic critique* employed against the more traditionally anti-Semitic Bruno Bauer. (17.) There is not a shred of evidence to back up this preposterous line of reasoning. The idea that *On the Jewish Question* would be some sort of a running joke, a punch line, is as idiotic and as asinine as it would be to suggest the same of Hitler's *Mein Kampf*.

Larry Ray, Professor of Sociology at the University of Kent responded to Professor Robert Fine in Engage Magazine. Ray is of the same school of thought as Fine in terms of supporting the theory that Marx anti-Semitism should be read as some sort of a joke. Ray also employs the same trick as Fine in terms of seeking to shift attention away from Marx anti-Semitism by raising Marx support for Jewish Emancipation. Ray proceeds to translate a sentence of *Zur Judenfrage* and interprets Marx to mean that *there is no room within emancipated humanity for Jews as a separate ethnic or cultural identity...a society where both cultural as well as economic difference is eliminated.*

Could Hitler have been any more explicit? Ray sees Marx as representing a *strand of left thinking that has been unable to address forms of oppression not directly linked to class.* I suppose this is an example of what has been referred to as British understatement yet this is not broad enough. Left thinking is obviously oriented toward a philosophy of collectivism, one that supports the equal opportunity oppression of all of humankind.

The British Professor of Political Science Iain Hamphsher-Monk chose the denial route in his textbook: *This work On The Jewish Question has been cited as evidence for Marx's supposed anti-Semitism, but only the most superficial reading of it could sustain such an interpretation.* (18.)

British journalist Frances Wheen, who wrote a biography on Karl Marx that won the Isaac Deutscher Memorial Prize, argued that *On the Jewish Question* should be interpreted in the context of

Marx debate with Bruno Bauer over Jewish Emancipation. Wheen wrote: *Those critics, who see this as a foretaste of 'Mein Kampf' overlook one, essential point in spite of the clumsy phraseology and crude stereotyping, the essay was actually written as a defense of the Jews. It was a retort to Bruno Bauer, who had argued that Jews should not be granted full civic rights and freedoms unless they were baptized as Christians.* (19.) These examples of legerdemain stretch credulity into an utterly unidentifiable form.

We will close the chapter with a surprising quote from the respected and indeed a revered and great Orthodox Rabbi Sir Jonathan Sacks, the Chief Rabbi of the United Kingdom, who stated that he regarded the term anti-Semitism when applied to Marx to be an anachronism. His justification for this assertion was because Marx wrote *On the Jewish Question* before the term anti-Semitism had entered into common parlance. With sincere respect to the most admired Chief Rabbi of Britain, this is an example of extreme splitting of hairs. The Spanish Inquisition, of the late Middle Ages in Spain, also occurred before the coinage of the term anti-Semitism. Does this mean that the Spanish Inquisition was not anti-Semitic? Was Haman, in the story recalled in the Book of Esther, who called for the annihilation of the Jews of Persia also not anti-Semitic?

Rabbi Sacks goes on to justify Marx anti-Semitism by claiming that major philosophers in his time had, after all, expressed similar views and that little awareness existed of the depths of European prejudice against Jews. Marx, according to the Chief Rabbi, was simply expressing the commonplace thinking of his era. Marx did much more than simply express the anti-Semitism that he was exposed to but was diminishing in his time thanks to the genuine American inspired influence of the enlightenment. Marx legitimized anti-Semitism by offering it a scientific gloss and he expounded upon it by formulating new versions of anti-Semitism. The new political and so-called scientific anti-Semitism espoused by Marx would profoundly influence the generations that followed him. (20.)

Conclusion

Is the left-wing anti-Semitism of Karl Marx alive today? Yes of course it is. Examples abound in which insidious left wing anti-Semitism is present on the college campuses of the western democracies as well as the anti-Semitism that is pervasive within the Arab and Muslim world. A major factor regarding the hostility directed against the State of Israel derives from Marx theory that Judaism is the font of self-interest and huckstering and that the god of the Jews is money. Never mind the fact that the society that is the State of Israel should server as a beacon of inspiration to Arabs and Muslims who might begin to shuffle off the oppressive socialistic millstones of their own corrupt regimes and then begin to develop some huckstering and money of their own in the form of private ownership and freedom.

The underlying cause of the left's hostility toward Israel is based upon the fact that Israel is a capitalist society, one that is allied with capitalist America. The left views Israel as an obstacle to their international socialist goal of public ownership and world order. Marx believed that if Judaism were to be *abolished* and if the world were to be emancipated from Judaism, then capitalism would dissolve. In *On the Jewish Question*, Marx wrote: *Emancipation from huckstering and money, consequently from practical, real Judaism, would be the self-emancipation of our time.* The people of the Middle East and for that matter the people of the world would be wise to wake up and emancipate themselves from these regressive ideas and in doing so walk out into the sunlight of freedom.

The message of *On the Jewish Question* is actually more profound and fundamental to the human experience than its mere anti-Semitism and opposition to capitalism per se, which is that the inherent right of individual citizen to own property and to be free should be abolished. Marx was successful in terms of modernizing and tapping into certain political, social, and psychological truths that are engrained within human nature itself and this is why his message remains relevant and potent today and why his work continues to threaten individual freedom. Marx message resonates with the darker side of human nature, with the darker side of the nature of all of us. As such, Marx message remains irresistible in many quarters.

When all is said and done, Marx philosophy appeals to our greed, envy, laziness, and basic immorality, aspects of our nature that are quite real and as such will never be *made impossible*. Sovereign and free individuals understand that it is in their *self-interest* to voluntarily restrain those darker aspects of their nature in order to achieve long-term success. Those living in a free society are more likely to restrain their darker impulses because they realize that someone else, or the State, will not bail them out if they personally have to reap the consequences of their excesses. The free society is founded on a system of law and order in which laws are the same for everyone at least in theory. Once the rules of the game are set, the players are then free to operate as they please and to compete.

Marxism tells a person that they are entitled to the property of their neighbor just because their neighbor has something that the person does not have. The main Marxist bumper sticker is *from each according to his abilities to each according to his needs*, which means that the needy person, however that need is defined, is entitled to the fruits of the labor of the achieving person. Entitlement means just that, the needy person is not expected to achieve anything in particular to be entitled to the property of his neighbor as his need in and of itself serves as the qualification.

The primary Marxist marketing point, one that has been assumed

to be true by many, that the Marxist program will help the needy and this is, or course, an absurd and dastardly lie given the fact that the free and achieving individual, acting on one of the more positive aspects of his nature, is more likely to help a person who is truly in need and to do so without any coercion required. Of course, it is true that many achieving people are not interested in helping others but that is their right and that is the cost of freedom. Their achievements in and of themselves, in a free market context, are often indirectly helping others in various ways. The freedom oriented political system recognizes human nature at it is, imperfect, and that, as such, the free system recognizes that some people will choose not to do well. The record shows that the free society is a system that is by far the more generous society to people in need than the socialist societies, those based on the Marxist axiom *from each according to his ability to each according to his need*, which have been responsible for more poverty, more disease and more human suffering than any in history.

Marxism appeals to the darker tendencies in of all of us as individuals, the side of us that feels jealous of the person or the group that we think might have something more than what we have. We would at least subconsciously like to somehow stop that person or group of people from having whatever it is that we think they have. We would like to steal or to *expropriate* their property from them, to use a term that was popularized by Lenin. However, Marxism manifests itself more insidiously when applied to societies and to nations.

In fact, Marxism is a system that can only apply to a society, as an individual cannot be a Marxist. It has been reported that even Marx himself acknowledged that *If anything is certain, it is that I am not a Marxist*. And indeed he was not. He lived off the largess of the privately owned property of others his entire life. I would venture to suggest that never has there been a single sane person has ever volunteered to be a Marxist in the literal sense.

The core belief of Marxism, a belief that draws its inspiration from ancient times, is collectivism and this stands in stark contrast to the western and Judeo-Christian view that the individual human being is paramount. Western civilization, drawing its antecedents from the Torah, Greek Philosophy particularly that of Aristotle, Christianity, Roman law, the Renaissance, the Anglo-Saxon system of separation of powers, and from American independence, honors the independence and the uniqueness, sacredness, and the sovereign natural rights of every single solitary living human being. Human experience has proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that this system is the most natural and fitting to the advancement of human life. The idea of the collective is an idea that is utterly false which is why the left is, per se, as ideology as opposed to a natural expression of reality.

Karl Marx, employing the function and work of the collectivist

mindset, assigned specific qualities to the Jewish people as a collective or as a *class*. Whether those qualities were good or bad, and from the perspective of freedom oriented people those assignments were good, the act and the mindset of collective assignment is wrong and is false. Groups of people, however they are defined, simply do not possess any inherent qualities per se. While various qualities can be learned, only the individual possesses distinct qualities. There is no such thing as a group, there never has been and never will be in any real sense only groups of individuals who associate either by birth or by choice. The individual is capable of joining or leaving the group or relating to a group in any way they see fit. Marx assignment of collective qualities for the Jews, and his claim that such assignments were scientific, gave birth to modern politico-scientific anti-Semitism.

Today's left continues the tradition of assigning various people to groups and to assigning collective qualities to those groups with the claim that those qualities are negative. The focus of the tactic today is usually corporations or "corporate interests," "billionaires," or Christian "religious fundamentalists." Once the group is assigned a specific quality, once that quality is assigned an allegedly "scientific" context with all of the proofs, the polling data, the anecdotal examples in place, than today's leftists, like the leftists of the past, are set to weave their conspiracy theories.

Marx was one of the most influential promoters, indeed the virtual inventor of the concept of collective identification with his codification of a false category that he called the bourgeois. A few years after the publication of *On the Jewish Question*, in *The Communist Manifesto* Marx expanded the collective designation of Jews as possessing certain qualities to the more universal alleged entity that he called the bourgeois. The collective concept would be further fueled by Darwin's theory of biological evolution of the species, a concept that would introduce a racist element into Marx collective invention. Thus the enterprise of viewing mankind as a collective as opposed to as individuals advanced in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

V. I. Lenin turned the so-called science of establishing collective categories into state policy in Russia in 1917 and by doing so he deliberately overturned a millennia that witnessed the development of legal and judicial rights for the individual. Thus, in Bolshevik Russia, a person could be tried, convicted, and executed for membership, or suspected membership in a group, or a collective category that was deemed by the Soviet government to be an enemy of socialism. In this manner, millions of people were executed in Russia because they were Kulaks, which were Russians involved in trade or who owned small plots of land, people who were members of forbidden ethnic or religious groups, or anyone who was deemed to be not politically correct or an enemy of the revolution. Lenin completely overturned a concept that had developed to the degree that it was almost taken for granted in America which was that the

individual could be charged with a crime due to an illegal action as opposed to as a member of a group.

An example of the collective mindset originated by Marx was provided by Martin Latsis, deputy chief of the Chêka, the Soviet secret service in the Ukraine. Latsis, who participated in many of the most heinous atrocities in the early Soviet period, articulated the principle that a collective category was cause for a death sentence when he explained *We are engaged in exterminating the bourgeois as a class. You need not prove that this or that man acted against the interests of the Soviet power. The first thing you have to ask an arrested person is: To what class does he belong, where does he come from, what kind of education did he have, what is his occupation? These questions are to decide the fate of the accused. That is the quintessence of the Red Terror.* (1.)

The legal birth of collectivism, and the collectivist mindset in Russia was not lost on the post World War I Germans who were looking for a scapegoat to blame on their loss of the war. Hitler latched on to blaming the Jews, and echoing Marx original thesis, and this proved to be very effective for his agenda of taking over Germany. Thus collectivism, collective blame and collective guilt, was the mindset that was responsible not just for the murders of tens of millions of those innocent people caught up in the web of a collectivist category that was deemed by the socialist state as standing in the way of progress but also for the murder of six million innocent Jews at the hands of the collectivist minded Nazis. Ironically, many well-meaning but completely unwitting liberals today are still talking about collectivism as a virtue, indeed it is still viewed as the ultimate virtue in many quarters.

Thus the Marxist appeal to the darker motivations of the individual is magnified a thousand times when Marxism becomes the accepted dogma of a group or when it becomes the official policy of a nation. Marxism, when adopted by a nation, metastasizes and immediately manifests itself in two basic ways. The first is the loss of freedom and property for the citizen and this the second is that the totalitarian Marxist state becomes an appendage in a one-world government in the making as the Marxist state participates at some level in world revolution. One world international government is at the very core of the Marxist idea and the Marxist work of transforming the entire planet into a workers paradise. Marx made the case clear in the final lines of *The Communist Manifesto: The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Workers of All Countries Unite!*

World government appeals to a very dark corner of the human

soul. The idea that a nation would impose its iron will on its own people is a sad and unnatural form of oppression. The idea that one government, however benevolent it may seem would impose its will on the entire world is an idea that is too evil to contemplate. Yet this is the ultimate expression of the so-called science of socialism. According to the theory, the only way, ultimately, that the scientific socialist experiment could work is if the scientists, the dictatorship of the proletariat, are able to wield control over every inch of the planet thus turning the entire human species into the equivalent of bacteria trapped inside a test-tube. Then, and only then, they reverently believe, would they, the enlightened clique of social scientists be able to conduct their grand experiment in an absolutely purified environment.

Yet the fact that Marx wrote *On the Jewish Question*, filled with such an apparent sense of malevolent hatred for one particular group of people, in this case the Jews, proved the utter fallacy and the falseness of the experiment itself and how could such a social experiment be anything other than a colossal farce? Obviously, in a one-world system the Jews, or whatever group or person is deemed to pose as an enemy of the state, would have no place to hide. Tens of millions of people found no place to hide in the limited socialistic world order experiments of the 20th Century, those conducted by the communists in Russia and China and by the National Socialists in Germany. Yet this idea of world control continues to excite and to percolate within the fecund imaginations of various people around the world, people who should know better.

The enduring appeal of Marxism can be discerned in the style of the Marxist texts and that is the absolute and rock solid sense of certainty in which the doctrines of Marxism has been proclaimed. Life is uncertain and is, in the traditional sense a veil of tears. Tragedy, deception, pain, loss, grief, disease, suffering and inevitable death are an unavoidable and inevitable part of life. In the cauldron of events, some natural and some self-inflicted, we all look for a sense of certainty from an outside source. This sense of certainty has traditionally been found in belief in God and in religious faith and practice yet religion actually does not provide the same sense of certainty as does Marxism which proclaims itself as a science. The idea that science could solve all human problems is attractive to the human mind and the promise of scientific solutions to the imperfect nature of life here on earth is an attractive prospect. The religious believer understands that they are accepting belief on faith while the Marxist clothes himself in the garment of what he claims to be absolute truth. This is why it doesn't matter that the theories of Marx have been proven to be false and why, when trying to communicate with most adherents of those theories one often feels like they are talking to a tree.

In the final analysis, the theory of Marxism stands for nothing.

The nihilist principle espoused by Marx was based on the principle that human society generally, and specific structures such as private property, family, Judaism, Christianity, trade etc. had to be utterly torn down and destroyed. That the final state of being was nothing and that there ultimately was no such thing as reality itself. Marxism does not offer anything to replace these institutions other than this vague conception of a so-called collective which, when all is said and done, means nothing. Marx and his followers offer no positive or constructive ideas that would improve human life. Other than offering a lot of empty and obscure sounding promises and sophistries, Marxism only tells us what is to be destroyed without ever telling us anything at all in terms of what is to be built. Naturally, and out of necessity stepping forward to fill the empty void, emerges the sheer, brute, arbitrary, and absolute power of the gun backed monopoly dictatorship.

The antidote to the poison of Marxism is the American system of government. On July 4, 1776, the American government changed the world. A government was established on the American continent that day that was most suitable to human nature and the proof of this has been the American experience ever since. The government that the American people established on that day was one in which an authority limited by a written constitution protected and defended the natural and sovereign rights of the individual. Americans understood that there was no such a thing as perfection and that there never will be any such thing as perfection, at least not perfection brought about by the mind and the hand of man. The American government respected the sovereignty of the states that joined the Federal system and the new government absolutely respected the rights of the other independent and sovereign nations of the world.

The American government was thus established on the principle of self-interest, free trade or what Marx called huckstering, and private ownership or what Marx derisively called money. Those great principles, along with a belief in a creator of the universe as opposed to a belief in a fabricated and man centered state, are the principles that have led to the establishment of the American Republic, which is the most free and the most progressive civilization mankind has ever known. Marx derisively ascribed those same qualities that have made America great to the Jewish people. Marx claimed that Judaism stood for these same qualities as America proudly stands for today and I, speaking both as an American and as an American Jew, hope and pray that in this one regard Marx was right.

Notes

Introduction

1. On the Jewish Question, written by Karl Marx in 1843, was published in Paris in 1844 under the title *Zur*

Judenfrage in the journal the *Deutch-Franzosische Jahrbucher*. In 1850, A French

translation appeared in Hermann

Ewerbeck's book *Qu'est-ce que la bible d'après la nouvelle philosophie allemande*. The second part of *On the Jewish*

Question, arguably the more anti-Semitic part, was published in German in 1881 by the socialist critic of Marx

German Reichstag member Eduard Bernstein as a response to an anti-Semitic article written by prominent German

historian and fellow Reichstag member Heinrich von Treitschke in which von Treitschke demanded that German Jews

assimilate and that they posed as a threat to Germany. The entire essay was published in 1890 in the *Berliner*

Volksblatt, edited by Wilhelm Liebknecht, a prominent revolutionary German socialist, journalist, friend and

collaborator of Marx, and member of the German Reichstag. Liebknecht's son, Karl Liebknecht, was a founder, along

with Rosa Luxemburg, of the German Communist Party and the Spartacist league, which was involved in a failed

Bolshevik style coup attempt against the post-war Weimar German Republic in 1919. An English translation was

published by H. J. Stenning in 1926 as one of a collection of essays by Marx.

2. Bernard Lewis. *Semites and Anti-Semites: An Inquiry into Conflict and Prejudice*. (1999). W.W. Norton & Company.

3. Karl Marx, *The Victory of the Counter-Revolution in Vienna*: *Neiue Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 136, 7 Nov. 1848.

4. Ibid.

The origins of Marxist anti-Semitism

1. James H. Billington, *Fire in the Minds of Men: Origins of the Revolutionary Faith*.

2. Ibid. James H. Billington is the perfect person to cite when writing about a topic as esoteric and as fraught with

controversy as is the Order of the Illuminati. Discussions of this topic are usually accompanied by accusations against

the author of the most withering and damning type for daring to bring it up. The writer on these topics is typically

accused of being a member of some sort of a far right-wing lunatic fringe, as someone who believes in flying saucers

and black helicopters, as someone who should be fitted for a tin hat and then sent off to the proverbial nuthouse. Yet

James H. Billington's credentials are as about as credible, and as liberal and as establishment as they come. Billington

received his doctorate from Oxford where he was a Rhodes Scholar, he became a History Professor at Harvard

University and at Princeton University, and he was a director of the Woodrow Wilson Center for Scholars. While at

Princeton, he founded the Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies and the scholarly publication the Wilson

Quarterly. On September 14, 1987, James Billington was sworn in as the Librarian of Congress where he continues to

serve at the time of the publication of this book. Billington's book *Fire in the Minds of Men* is one of the most

definitive books ever written on the topic of the history of communism from the French to the Russian revolutions.

One of America's most respected scholars, Dr. Billington delves into the secretive and even the occult nature of

communism and he does so with the utmost in academic excellence as well as a virtual

treasure trove of fascinating
and well-sourced footnotes.

3. Ibid. Dr. Billington wrote that the order of the Illuminati spread across Germany by means of infiltrating and co-opting many of the already existing conservative Masonic Lodges of Germany.

4. J.P.L. de la Roche, Marquis de Luchet, *Essai sur la secte des illumines*, 1789, 2nd ed., p 73-76. The French nobleman

de Luchet published his book after the exposure of the Illuminati by Bavarian authorities to expose the danger to the

French people yet his book served to spread its ideas further and create fascination within the French elite at the

beginning of the revolution. De Luchet describes an alleged Illuminati initiation: *Marks were made with blood on the*

prostate nude body of the candidate. His testicles were bound by a pink and poppy-colored cord; and he renounced

all other allegiances before five white-hooded phantoms with bloody banners after a 'colossal figure' appeared

through a fire. Finally, the bands and marks were removed, and he was accepted into the higher order by drinking

blood before seven black candles. Deluded people...learn that there exists a conspiracy in favor of despotism against

liberty, of incapacity against talent, of vice against virtue, of ignorance against enlightenment...This society aims at

governing the world...Its object is universal domination. This plan may seem extraordinary. Incredible...yes, but not

chimerical...no such calamity has ever yet affected the world.

5. Johnson, Paul (1988) *Intellectuals*. Harper & Roe Publishers

6. Ibid.

7. Karl Marx, "The Eastern Question" (ed. by Eleanor Marx & Edward Aveling, 1897: new ed. 1969). pp. 600-606.

8. Blackledge, Paul, *Reflections on the Marxist Theory of History*, Manchester University Press, 2006

9. Gould, Steven Jay, *The Richness of Life: The essential Steven Jay Gould*, W.W. Norton, 2007

On the Jewish Question - Prelude to Jew Hatred

1. James H. Billington, *Fire in the Minds of Men: Origins of the Revolutionary Faith*.

2. Karl Marx, *The Victory of the Counter-Revolution in Vienna*: *Neiue Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 136, 7 Nov. 1848.

3. Karl Marx, *On the Jewish Question* The edition used by this author appears of the website www.marxists.org and is proofed and corrected by Andy Blunden, Matthew Grant and Matthew Carmody 2008-2009, Mark Harris 2010.

4. Paul Johnson, *Intellectuals*, Harper & Roe Publishers

On the Jewish Question and the Bolsheviks

1. Anthony C. Sutton, *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*. Veritas Publications 1981.

2. Paul Johnson, *Modern Times: The World from the Twenties to the Eighties*. Harper & Roe Publishers.

3. *The Black Book of Communism: Crimes, Terror, Repression*. Harvard University Press.

4. Ibid.

5. Winston Churchill, *Zionism versus Bolshevism: A struggle for the soul of the Jewish people*. Illustrated Sunday

Herald, February 8, 1920 page 5.

6. Alexander Solzhenitsyn, *Two Hundred Years Together: Part One*, Vagrius (2005) Russian
On the Jewish Question and Hitler

1. On the Jewish Question was re-published in German in the *Berliner Volksblatt*, October 1890. This publication was edited by Wilhelm Liebknecht who was one of the principle founders of the Social Democratic Party of Germany.

Liebknecht, who was also a founder of the Communist League and who was a lifelong associate of Karl Marx, was the father of Karl Leibknecht who, along with Rosa Luxemburg, formed the Spartacist League and was involved in an attempted communist coup in Berlin in 1919.

2. James H. Billington, *Fire in the Minds of Men: Origins of the Revolutionary Faith*.

Dr. Billington explains what is meant by this mysterious slogan *liberty, equality, fraternity*, a slogan that has entered

common parlance with the banality of a bumper sticker. Liberty, explains Dr. Billington, stands for the principle that

underlies the American Revolution and means just that, individual liberty. Equality expressed the principles that would

evolve into the communist movement, as what is meant by equality is de-facto and absolute equality where the

individual, stripped of property, belief in the supernatural, memory, and any other attribute that might make him

unequal to his fellow man forms an international collectivist ant colony. Fraternity expressed the principles that would

evolve into Fascism and Nazism, hyper-nationalist fraternal associations based upon common race, language, or

ethnicity where the population would be expected to sacrifice freedom for the good of the super strong nation.

3. Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*

4. Hamann, Brigitte; Thornton, Thomas (1999), *Hitler's Vienna. A dictator's apprenticeship*, Oxford University Press.

According to Hamann and Thomas, Hitler, during his pre-war period in Vienna, was a regular guest for dinner in a

noble Jewish house and he interacted well with Jewish merchants who tried to sell his paintings.

5. 1919 picture of Hitler: Historisches Lexikon Bayerns,

http://www.historisches-lexikon-bayerns.de/document/artikel_44676_bilder_value_6_beisetzung-eisners3.jpg,

retrieved 2008-05-22

The truth regarding whether Hitler was a left-wing socialist in his early years and whether Hitler supported the

post-war 1919 Bavarian socialist government of Kurt Eisner will not ever likely be definitively known. Certainly,

Hitler condemned Marxism in the text of *Mein Kampf*, which, most historians have stated, Hitler did not actually

write. It could be said that most books about important political leaders or causes go through varying degrees of biased

revisions, which might have meant that Hitler's left wing past was airbrushed out of the picture at the time of *Mein*

Kampf's 1925 publication when he headed the Nazi Party. Hitler's anti-Semitism, however, which is included in the

part of *Mein Kampf* that deals with his early biography, would be no more inconsistent with the left as it would be

with the right in post-war Germany and Austria.

6. Spartacus Educational <http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/GERhitler.htm>. Spartacus Educational is a left-wing

British website. It is not unreasonable to suggest that Hitler started out as a leftist. His life in Vienna in the years leading up to the war which broke out in August 1914, when he was 24, what little is known of it could fit the profile of a leftist revolutionary. He was comfortably supported by his late father's pension and he never had to work. He lived the life of a bohemian artist and sold his art whenever possible. In *Mein Kampf*, Hitler acknowledged, although obliquely, that he immersed himself in Marxism in those years.

7. Stackelberg, Roderick (2007), *The Routledge companion to Nazi Germany*, New York, NY: Routledge, p. 9
8. Spartacus Educational
9. Schivelbusch, Wolfgang (2007) *Three New Deals: Reflections on Roosevelt's America, Mussolini's Italy and Hitler's Germany 1933-1939* Picador. In this well balanced book, German cultural historian Wolfgang Schivelbusch does not equate Roosevelt with Hitler, Mussolini, or for that matter Stalin, all his contemporaries, he simply contrasts the European authoritarian empires with certain stylistic aspects of the New Deal.
10. Ibid.

On the Jewish Question apologists

1. Abram Leon. On the Jewish Question - A Marxist Interpretation (1946) originally published in French. First published in English in Mexico City 1950.
2. Hyam Maccoby. *Antisemitism and Modernity: Innovation and Continuity*. Routledge. (2006).
3. Ibid.
4. Isaac Deutscher *Message of the non-Jewish Jew*. From the American Socialist collection of Sol Dollinger (1958)
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid
8. Tamara Deutscher (1968), Isaac Deutscher 1907-1967.
9. Avineri, Shlomo (1964). *Marx and Jewish Emancipation*. *Journal of the History of Ideas* (University of Pennsylvania Press)
10. Louis Althusser 1965. Feuerbach's Philosophical Manifestos: first published in *La Nouvelle Critique*, December 1960.
11. Louis Althusser 1965, *On the Young Marx: Theoretical Questions* La Pensée, March-April 1961.
12. David McLellan: 1970 *Marx before Marxism*
13. Stephen J. Greenblatt: (Winter, 1978) *Marlowe, Marx, and Anti-Semitism*, in: *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 5, No. 2
14. Ibid.
15. Y. Peled (1992) *From theology to sociology: Bruno Bauer and Karl Marx on the question of Jewish emancipation*, *History of Political Thought*, Volume 13, Number 3.
16. Robert Fine (May 2006) *Karl Marx and the Radical Critique of anti-Semitism*, Engage Journal 2
17. Ibid.
18. Iain Hampsher-Monk (1992) *A History of Modern Political Thought*, Blackwell Publishing.

19. Wheen, F., Karl Marx

20. Sacks, Jonathan (1997). *The Politics of Hope*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Conclusion

1. Latsis, Martin (1920) *Two Years of Struggle in the Internal Front*. Moscow: Gos. izd-vo,

Bibliography

Barruel, Abbe Agustin (1798-1799) *Memoirs Illustrating the History of Jacobinism*

Billington, James H. (1999). *Fire in the Minds of Men: Origins of the Revolutionary Faith*.

New Brunswick, N.J.:

Transaction Publishers.

Deutscher, Isaac (1958) *Message of the non-Jewish Jew*. From the American Socialist collection of Sol Dollinger

Hitler, Adolf (1925) *Mein Kampf*

Johnson, Paul (1988) *Intellectuals*. Harper & Roe Publishers

Johnson, Paul (1983) *Modern Times: The World from the Twenties to the Eighties*. Harper & Roe Publishers

J.P.L. de la Roche, Marquis de Luchet, (1789) *Essai sur la secte des illumines*.

Kramer, Mark, Murphy, Jonathan, Courtois, Stephane, Panne, Jean-Louis, *The Black Book of Communism: Crimes,*

Terror, Repression. Harvard University Press; 1st American Edition edition (October 15, 1999)

Marx, Karl (1897). *The Eastern Question: A Reprint of letters written 1853-1856 dealing with the events of the*

Crimean War. London, Swan Sonnenschein & Co. LTD. Edited by Eleanor Marx Aveling and Edward Aveling.

Marx, Karl (1844). *On the Jewish Question*. First published in the Deutsch-Französische Jahrbucher.

Leon, Abram (1946) *On the Jewish Question - A Marxist Interpretation*.

Schivelbusch, Wolfgang (2007) *Three New Deals: Reflections on Roosevelt's America, Mussolini's Italy and Hitler's*

Germany 1933-1939 Picador.

Strasser, Otto (1940) *Hitler and I* Translated from the French *Hitler Et Moi*

<http://mailstar.net/otto-strasser-hitler.html>.